School Improvement Grants Application

Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

CFDA Numbers: 84.377A; 84.388A



Wyoming Department of Education

State Education Agency (SEA) Application 2010-2013

APPLICATION COVER SHEET – CSSO SIGNATURE	2
ACRONYMS	3
PART I: SEA REQUIREMENTS	4
PART II: LEA REQUIREMENTS	16
APPENDIX A: DEFINING AND IDENTIFYING WYOMING'S TIER I, II, AND	III SCHOOLS 21
APPENDIX B: WYOMING'S TIER I, II, & III SCHOOLS	25
APPENDIX C: WYOMINGS STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT OVERVI	IEW27
APPENDIX D: IMPLMENTATION TIMELINES	28
APPENDIX E: WAIVER REQUEST DOCUMENATION	32
APPENDIX F: LEA APPLICATION	38
APPENDIX G: USED FEEDBACK AND WDE RESPONSEAppendix H: Second USED Feedback and WDE Response	39
•	

1 Acronyms

For ease of reviewing this document, the Wyoming Department of Education would like to define the following acronyms used in this application:

- CSO Charter School Operator
- CMO Charter Management Organization
- EMO Education Management Organization
- GMS Grants Management System
- MAP Measure of Academic Progress, a computerized adaptive test used most Wyoming school districts
- NCA North Central Accreditation Association, Part of AdvancED
- PAWS Proficiency Assessment of Wyoming Students, Wyoming's State Assessment
- PLA Persistently Lowest Achieving
- SSoS State System of Support
- WDE Wyoming Department of Education
- USED US Department of Education

APPLICATION COVER SHEET

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS

Legal Name of Applicant:	Applicant's Mailing Address:				
Wyoming Department of Education	2300 Capitol Avenue				
	Hathaway Building, 2 nd Floor				
	Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050				
	1 1 0 2 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				
State Contact for the School Improvement Grant					
Since Conduct for the School Improvement Grant					
Name: Christine Steele					
Position and Office: Division Director, Federal Programs					
Contact's Mailing Address:					
2300 Capitol Avenue,					
Hathaway Building, 1st Floor					
Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050					
Telephone: (307) 777-6216					
Fax: (307) 777-7633					
Email address: csteel@educ.state.wy.us					
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):					
Dr. Jim McBride, State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Telephone: (307) 777-7675				
, some approximation of the most delice	(307) 777-7073				
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:	Date:				
x Jim McBride					
x yww milestra	9/13/2010				
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to comply with all requirements applicable to the School					
Improvement Grants program, including the assurances co	ntained herein and the conditions that apply to any waivers that				
the State receives through this application.					

Part I: SEA Requirements

As part of its application for a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA, an SEA must provide the following information.

A. ELIGIBLE SCHOOLS

Link to Definition:

The link will be provided after our Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools definition has been approved by the USED. The list will be contained on the WDE website, www.k12.wy.us.

Please see Appendix A of this document for WDE's Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools definition and Appendix B of this document for the WDE Tiered list of schools based on that definition. Please note that this application does not contain a complete definition at this time as it has not been approved by the USED. The WDE will provide the final definition and the tiered list based on that definition once approval has been given.

B. EVALUATION CRITERIA

<u> Part 1</u>

The three actions listed in Part 1 are ones that an LEA must take prior to submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, the SEA must describe, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate an LEA's application with respect to each of the following actions:

(1) The LEA has analyzed the needs of each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application and has selected an intervention for each school.

Embedded within the application are the questions the LEA will need to answer to show that they have analyzed the needs of their school, what School Intervention Model they have chosen, and why they chose that model.

In determining their needs, the LEA should review the school's NCA Profile, analyze the school's PAWS data, and data from one other rigorous district-based assessment commonly used within that district. The LEA should also go through the questions contained in B (2) and answer them to help determine what School Intervention Model is best suited for the needs of the school. This comprehensive needs assessment should be done through their School Improvement Team which is comprised of school leadership, teachers, and parents – additional members from the LEA Senior Leadership Team should be added in not already in place.

The WDE will provide technical assistance as needed through its SSoS.

(2) The LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools.

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the following questions concerning the model they wish to implement. Technical assistance by the WDE SSoS will be provided to LEA/Schools to help with the needs assessment to determine if a school can implement a School Intervention Model.

The Turnaround Model

- 1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
- 2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
- 3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
- 4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
- 5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
- 6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
- 7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
- 8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
- 9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
- 10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

The Restart Model

- 1. Are there qualified CSO, CMO, or EMOs willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
- 2. Will qualified community groups initiate a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
- 3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
- 4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?

- 5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
- 6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
- 7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
- 8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?
- 9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
- 10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

The Transformation Model

- 1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
- 2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
- 3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
- 4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
- 5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

- 1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
- 2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
- 3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the reenrollment process?
- 4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
- 5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
- 6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
- 7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
- 8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
- 9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
- 10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
- 11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
- 12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment

area, or community?

- 13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?
- (3) The LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds (taking into account any waiver extending that period received by either the SEA or the LEA).

Within their application, the LEA/School will budget funds to the specific sections/costs/activities that relate to the School Improvement Intervention Models the LEA/School is implementing. At the end of the application, a Budget Overview will be completed by the LEA/School for each year of funding. Revisions to this budget will need to be completed each spring based on changes identified by the LEA/School. The LEA/School will also be required to complete periodic expenditure reports throughout the lifecycle of the grant so the WDE can monitor expenditures to ensure that spending stays within the budgeted amount. This process is already in place for other grants that are housed within the WDE GMS.

The areas in which funds will be budgeted are:

- Transformation Model:
 - Teachers and Leaders
 - Instructional and Support Strategies
 - Time and Support
 - Governance
- Turnaround Model:
 - Teachers and Leaders
 - Instructional and Support Strategies
 - Time and Support
 - Governance
- o Restart Model:
 - Partnership with CSO, CMO, or EMO
 - Review Process
- School Closure Model:
 - Closure
 - Transferring of Students
 - Civil Rights Considerations

Part 2

The actions in Part 2 are ones that an LEA may have taken, in whole or in part, prior to

submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant but, most likely, will take after receiving a School Improvement Grant. Accordingly, an SEA must describe how it will assess the LEA's commitment to do the following:

(1) Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements.

This is embedded within the LEA application within the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process. There are only four School Intervention Models a School/LEA can select and those are consistent with the final regulations. Review of the grant applications will be done by a team of WDE grant readers — these readers will be comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and WDE LEA Coaches. This will ensure a thorough review of the grant and adherence to the final requirements.

LEAs that do not fully and effectively describe their interventions will not be considered for funding because this is such a major component of the final requirements. Subsequently, this will be reviewed annually at the end of each school year when the LEA/School updates their application during the Grant Renewal process. Changes to the existing interventions will be reviewed for consistency with the final requirements - changes not consistent the final requirements will not be accepted.

(2) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

This is embedded within the application as part of the first section (Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators) of the intervention selected by the School/LEA in the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this requirement is not in place and the LEA/School has selected the Restart Intervention Model, the LEA/School will not be considered for funding.

(3) Align other resources with the interventions.

This is embedded within the application as the Additional Resources section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this is not in place within the LEA/School grant, the scoring on their rubric will be affected.

(4) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

This is embedded within the application as part of the questions contained at the end of the intervention selected by the School/LEA in the Intervention/Action Plan section and will be reviewed during the application review process – please see B Part 2 (2) for details. If this requirement is not in place and the LEA/School has selected the Restart, Transformation or Turnaround Models, the LEA/School will not be considered for funding.

(5) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This has not been included within the application and will have to be reviewed as the

grant cycle comes to an end. The year before the grant ends, beginning of the 2012-2013 grant year, the LEA/School will have to complete a funding study to determine how the LEA/School will sustain the reform efforts once funding ends in 2013. This data/analysis will be incorporated into the application at a later date so the information can be uploaded directly into the grant.

C. CAPACITY

An LEA that applies for a School Improvement Grant must serve each of its Tier I schools using one of the four school intervention models unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity to do so. If an LEA claims it lacks sufficient capacity to serve each Tier I school, the SEA must evaluate the sufficiency of the LEA's claim. Claims of lack of capacity should be scrutinized carefully to ensure that LEAs effectively intervene in as many of their Tier I schools as possible.

The SEA must explain how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement a school intervention model in each Tier I school. The SEA must also explain what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA demonstrates.

It is up to the LEA/School to provide the data and evidence to support their claim that it does not have enough capacity to implement a School Intervention Model. Data for support should be, but not limited to:

Restart:

• Data to support the lack of CSO, CMO, or EMOs available to their area.

Closure:

• Data to support that an LEA does not have a sufficient number of schools to facilitate the closure of a school

Transformation:

- Data supporting the lack of applicants to the LEA for staff and principals
- Barriers to the recruitment, placement, and retention of staff

Turnaround:

- Data supporting the lack of applicants to the LEA for staff and principals
- Barriers to the recruitment, placement, and retention of staff

Other data should include specific challenges or circumstances that pertain to the LEA, size, location, number of schools, number of schools in improvement status, and number of schools identified in Tier I, II, and III.

This data will be reviewed by a review panel within the WDE comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and WDE LEA Coaches. Upon review, the panel will make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who will make the final decision as to whether or not the LEA has shown that they do not have sufficient capacity to implement a School Intervention Model. Please see Appendix G for additional information.

D. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

(1) Describe the SEA's process and timeline for approving LEA applications.

The 1003 g School Improvement Funds application will be housed within the WDE's GMS so the application will be electronic. Qualifying LEA/Schools will be able to create, complete, and submit their application on-line. Review of the grant applications will be done by a team of WDE grant readers – these readers will be comprised of Federal Programs staff, members of the WDE District Support and Coordination Team, and WDE LEA Coaches. Each reader will complete an on-line rubric for each grant. Scores will be compiled, evaluated, and ranked. Grant awards will be determined based on scores and availability of funds. Timeline is as follows:

- March, 2010 during regional Title I Director Meetings, the requirements for the grant will be discussed and questions will be answered
- April, 2010 LEAs evaluate schools to determine if they can and should apply for 1003 g funds
- April 30, 2010 Letter of intent to apply for 1003 g funds due to the WDE
- May 14, 2010 application will be on-line for LEA/Schools to complete; video conference with all qualifying LEA/Schools to go over application and answer questions
- July 12, 2010 deadline for application submission
- July , 2010 Grant Reader training
- July, 2010 review of grants by a team of WDE grant readers
- July 30, 2010 LEA/Schools will be notified of grant approval.
- August 9, 2010 schools will get awards their Grant Award Notification; LEA/Schools can begin to encumber funds starting this date
- Fall, School year 2010-2011 Districts implement the reform model
- September 1, 2010 LEA/Schools will be able to draw down and use funds.

Also, please see the detailed implementation timelines found in Appendix D.

(2) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing an LEA's annual goals for student achievement for its Tier I and Tier II schools and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier I or Tier II schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals and making progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements.

The Goals will be measured by the data that the LEA/school selects to demonstrate progress in student achievement as a summative measure. A second measure is selected as a progress measure so that teachers can also use formative assessments. LEAs will be required to revise and update their grant application each year by June 30 during the Grant Renewal. At that

time, the LEA/School will update the current application, strategies, timelines, and budgets. The LEA/School will also be required to upload data and analysis to support whether or not the school has met their goals and/or making progress on their leading indicators. A section will also be built into the application to capture and report required data for the USED as outlined by the final requirements.

Because PAWS data is not available until July, the LEA will be required to select an additional indicator to measure student achievement. This data should be from a source that is available so the LEA can submit that data by June 30. LEAs will be asked to submit PAWS data and analysis by October 1.

If the LEA has not completed the necessary updates, data reviews, and reporting, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds from this grant until those requirements have been met. Likewise, if PAWS data has not been uploaded and analyzed by October 1, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds until that data has been submitted.

Data will be reviewed by an independent reviewer hired by the WDE and evaluated as to whether or not the school has met their goals and/or is making progress on their leading indicators. Initial approved to continue with the grant will be given by the reviewer, with the assumption that PAWS data will be uploaded by October 1. The reviewer also can request any clarifications on the data submitted at this time. Upon review of all the data, the reviewer will report their findings to the WDE and give a recommendation as to whether to renew the grant, give conditional approval for an additional year based on meeting goals and/or making progress, or cancel the grant based on the LEA/School not meeting their goals and making progress, or for not fully and efficiently implementing the grant as is written.

The continuing application will reflect whether or not the goal has been met and may impact the level of funding in the second and third year as awarded by the continuing application. If the goal is not met, the Evaluator will work with the District Coach, School Improvement Team to provide technical assistance to include interventions in the continuing application that address the reason for not meeting the goal.

(3) Describe the SEA's process for reviewing the goals an LEA establishes for its Tier III schools (subject to approval by the SEA) and how the SEA will determine whether to renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant with respect to one or more Tier III schools in the LEA that are not meeting those goals.

This process will be the same as for Tier I and Tier II schools. Please see D (2)

(4) Describe how the SEA will monitor each LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to ensure that it is implementing a school intervention model fully and effectively in the Tier I and

Tier II schools the LEA is approved to serve.

Starting October, 2010, an independent reviewer hired by the WDE will go to each school to review the implementation of the Schools Intervention Model. This reviewer will provide periodic reports to the WDE as to the implementation and progress of each school. Reviews will be conducted at least once per semester during each school year, with more if it is determined, through the reviewer's evaluation, that the school in not successfully implementing the School Intervention Model selected. A rubric will be used to evaluate this implementation, but has not yet been developed.

(5) Describe how the SEA will prioritize School Improvement Grants to LEAs if the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all eligible schools for which each LEA applies.

Priority funding will be given first to Tier I schools and then to Tier II schools. If further priority ranking is still needed, priority will be given to those schools that were identified for Tier I or Tier II based on their graduation rates. If further prioritization is needed, it will be based the ranking of the schools within each Tiered list. Each Tier has already been priority ranked, so please see Wyoming's attached Tiered list — Appendix B.

(6) Describe the criteria, if any, that the SEA intends to use to prioritize among Tier III schools.

Priority funding will first be given to Tier III schools who are fully implementing all the required activities for one of the School Intervention Models as outline by the final requirements. After that, priority will be given to those Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status that were not identified in Tier I. Lastly, priority will be based on the ranking of the remaining Title I and Title I eligible schools within the Tier III list. Priority has already been assigned to these schools, so please see Wyoming's attached Tiered list – Appendix B.

(7) If the SEA intends to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools, identify those schools and indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school.

This is not an option Wyoming's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Jim McBride, chooses to exercise – the WDE does not intend to take over any Tier I or Tier II schools.

(8) If the SEA intends to provide services directly to any schools in the absence of a takeover, identify those schools and, for Tier I or Tier II schools, indicate the school intervention model the SEA will implement in each school, and provide evidence of the LEA's approval to have the SEA provide the services directly.

This is not applicable at this time; please see statement in area D (7).

E. ASSURANCES

By submitting this application, the WDE assures that it will do the following:

- ✓ Comply with the final requirements and ensure that each LEA carries out its responsibilities.
- Award each approved LEA a School Improvement Grant in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the SEA approves the LEA to serve.
- ✓ Apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.
- Carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 school improvement funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with the final requirements if not every Tier I school in the State receives FY 2009 school improvement funds to implement a school improvement model in the 2010-2011 school year (unless the SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve every Tier I school in the State).
- ✓ Ensure, if the SEA is participating in the Department's differentiated accountability pilot, that its LEAs will use school improvement funds consistent with the final requirements.
- ✓ Monitor each LEA's implementation of the interventions supported with school improvement funds.
- ✓ To the extent a Tier I or Tier II school implementing the restart model becomes a charter school LEA, hold the charter school operator or charter management organization accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds the respective entity accountable, for meeting

the final requirements.

- Post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants, all final LEA applications and a summary of the grants that includes the following information: name and NCES identification number of each LEA awarded a grant; amount of the grant; name and NCES identification number of each school to be served; and type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- ✓ Report the specific school-level data required in section III of the final requirements.

F. SEA RESERVATION

The SEA must briefly describe the activities related to administration, evaluation, and technical assistance that the SEA plans to conduct with the State-level funds it has received from its School Improvement Grant.

The WDE will use the 5% set-aside for the School Improvement funds for the cost of developing, implementing, and maintain the 1003 g School Improvement Grant on the WDE GMS. Funds will also be used to hire an independent reviewer/evaluator to monitor and evaluate the implementation of these grants and report to progress, or lack of it, to the WDE. The remainder of the funds will be used for in-state travel expenses related to stakeholder meetings, as well as out-of –state travel to meetings, symposiums, and conferences related to School Improvement and these funds.

G. CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein.

✓ The WDE has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its application.

The SEA may also consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.

✓ The SEA has consulted with other relevant stakeholders, including internal stakeholders, administrators from LEAs that will be receiving these funds, and RMC Research/NWRCC

H. WAIVERS

Wyoming requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier I or Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

- ✓ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- ✓ Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- ✓ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding this waiver request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (e.g., by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

Part II: LEA Requirements

An SEA must develop an LEA application form that it will use to make subgrants of school improvement funds to eligible LEAs. That application must contain, at a minimum, the information set forth below. An SEA may include other information that it deems necessary in order to award school improvement funds to its LEAs.

The SEA must attach its LEA application form to its application to the Department for a School Improvement Grant.

Application has been attached, please see Appendix E – please note final application format will be different as this grant is to be made available electronically via our Grants Management System.

LEA APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

A. SCHOOLS TO BE SERVED

An LEA must identify each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve and identify the model that the LEA will use in each Tier I and Tier II school.

A list of schools indentified in Tier I, II, and III will be provided to all LEAs in the state and will be on the WDE website as well. During the spring Title I meeting, LEA Title I directors will be given information on 1003 g School Improvement Funds, how schools are identified, which schools are identified, and the application process. LEAs will then evaluate which of their schools can and should apply for these funds – the WDE SSoS will provide technical assistance to help LEAs in this decision if needed. A letter of intent to apply is due to the WDE by April 30, 2010. LEAs who choose to will submit an application for each school it wishes to serve by completing an application within the WDE GMS. Through the WDE review process within the GMS, all grants will be reviewed and given funding based on their rubric scores and funding criteria set by the final regulations. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

B. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

- (1) For each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must demonstrate that—
 - The LEA has analyzed the needs of each school and selected an intervention for each school; and
 - The LEA has the capacity to use school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected.

LEA/Schools will need to complete a thorough needs assessment utilizing existing data. This can be found in the Needs Assessment section of the LEA application. Please see attached application, Appendix E. The WDE SSoS will provide technical assistance to LEA/Schools conducting a needs assessment to determine whether or not they can and

should be applying for 1003 g funds.

(2) If the LEA is not applying to serve each Tier I school, the LEA must explain why it lacks capacity to serve each Tier I school.

The LEA/School will need to complete the Capacity section of the grant application to assess whether or not it has the capacity to serve Tier I schools. The LEA/School, in conjunction with its needs assessment, should also complete the questions in Part I, (B) 2 of this application (also found in Appendix D of the LEA application). Please see attached application, Appendix E.

- (3) The LEA must describe actions it has taken, or will take, to—
 - Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
 - Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - *Align other resources with the interventions;*
 - Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

This found in the Intervention/Action Plan section of the LEA application. The LEA/School will need to complete this for the School Intervention Model selected. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

(4) The LEA must include a timeline delineating the steps it will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application.

This is found in the Intervention/Action Plan section of the LEA application. For each intervention, the LEA/School must identify the start and end date of each activity, as well as the key milestone for that activity. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

(5) The LEA must describe the annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics that it has established in order to monitor its Tier I and Tier II schools that receive school improvement funds.

This is capture in as the Implementation Indicator for the intervention selected in the Intervention/Action Plan section of the LEA application. For the intervention selected, the LEA must complete the Implementation Indicator, the Desired Outcomes for that indicator, and the Procedures for Evaluating the Implementation Indicators. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

(6) For each Tier III school the LEA commits to serve, the LEA must identify the services the school will receive or the activities the school will implement.

Please see attached application, Appendix E.

(7) The LEA must describe the goals it has established (subject to approval by the SEA) in order to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

This is the same process that has been described above. The only change is that

LEA/Schools in Tier III are not required to implement the requirements as outline by the final requirements. If they modify these requirements, they must explain how they have modified the intervention in the questions contained at the end of each Intervention Model Action Plan. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

(8) As appropriate, the LEA must consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the LEA's application and implementation of school improvement models in its Tier I and Tier II schools.

This is part of the needs assessment the LEA/School must complete. It is also part of the questions contained at the end of each Intervention Model Action Plan. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

C. BUDGET

The LEA must provide a budget that indicates the amount of school improvement funds the LEA will use each year to—

- Implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- Conduct LEA-level activities designed to support implementation of the selected school intervention models in the LEA's Tier I and Tier II schools; and
- Support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

LEA/Schools will budget by activity to ensure that they budget effectively and efficiently. At the end of the application, a budget overview will be completed for each year, using the budget from the action plan. Periodic expenditure reports will also be required by each applicant awarded 1003 g funds, as well as a final expenditure report when the grant cycle has been completed. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

D. ASSURANCES: An LEA must include the following assurances in its application for a School Improvement Grant.

The LEA must assure that it will—

- (1) Use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the final requirements;
- (2) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- (3) If it implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or education management organization accountable for complying with the final requirements; and
- (4) Report to the SEA the school-level data required under section III of the final requirements.

An assurance section with the necessary LEA and schools signatures is a required section in the LEA application. Please see attached application, Appendix E.

E. WAIVERS

The LEA must check each waiver that the LEA will implement. If the LEA does not intend to implement the waiver with respect to each applicable school, the LEA must indicate for which schools it will implement the waiver.

- ✓ Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.
- ✓ "Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.
- ✓ Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

The LEA/Schools is required to indicate if it does not wish to implement the any of the waivers requested by the WDE within the grant. Please see the attached LEA application, Appendix E.

Appendix A: Defining and Identifying Wyoming's Tier I, II and III Schools

In an effort to blend State and Federal requirements and to create a unified comprehensive system for assisting persistently lowest-achieving schools, Wyoming has one definition and method of identifying Tier I, II, and III schools for School Improvement Grants and also for Race to the Top and State Fiscal Stabilization funding. In the December 2009 School Improvement Grants Application for funding under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Selecting schools eligible for funding requires that the SEA identify three levels of need described as Tier I, II, and III schools, the basis for the identification of those schools is as follows:

Identifying Tier I Schools

Tier I schools consist of the following:

Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

- Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the "allstudents" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
- 2. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier II Schools

Tier II schools consist of the following:

Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

- 1. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the "all-students" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
- 2. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier III Schools

Tier III schools consist of the following:

Is any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; or

- 1. Is a Title I eligible school among the lowest quintile (20%) of performance based the ranking of the "all-students" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; and
- 2. Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' <u>Academic Achievement</u> (performance) on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

- 1. **Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade**: The statewide percentage of students testing proficient in each grade. All students tested in Wyoming public schools are included.
- 2. Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient: As testing for each grade level is independent of testing at other grade levels, the enrollment-by-grade makeup of each school must be taken into account to create a performance measure that will be valid for performance comparison of all Wyoming schools. To accomplish this need, the <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> values for each grade served by a school are averaged, weighted by the percentage of students enrolled in each grade served.
 - a. Examples:
 - i. Suppose that <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> is 50% for fourth grade and 60% for fifth grade.
 - ii. Example 1: A school serves only the fourth and fifth grades with enrollment of 50 fourth grade students and 50 fifth grade students.
 - 1. Half (50%) the students are enrolled in fourth grade, and half are enrolled in fifth grade.
 - With equal enrollment weighting (half the 100 total students are in each grade), the
 weighted average target likewise becomes the halfway point between the fourth grade
 and fifth grade <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> values (50% and 60%,
 respectively). This halfway point, the <u>Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient</u>, is
 then 55%.
 - a. Mathematically, this 55% weighted average is calculated as [(50 fourth grade students * 50% <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> for fourth grade) + (50 fifth grade students * 60% <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> for fifth grade)] divided by 100 students total enrolled in the school.
 - iii. Example 2: A school serves only the fourth grade, with a total enrollment of 100 fourth grade students.
 - 1. With all 100 students enrolled in fourth grade, the <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> for fourth grade of 50% becomes the <u>Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient for the school.</u>

- 3. **Relative Proficiency Performance**: The comparative final metric, this is the difference between the percent of students proficient in a school and the <u>Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient</u> applicable to the school's particular enrollment-by-grade makeup.
 - a. <u>Relative Proficiency Performance</u> values are calculated as positive or negative percentages. The higher a positive percentage, the better a school's performance on current year testing. The lower a negative percentage, the more a school is in need of improvement.
 - b. <u>Relative Proficiency Performance</u> values are then ranked. The higher the percentage, the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the percentage, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' <u>Progress</u> in performance on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

- 1. As described within Wyoming's <u>Academic Achievement</u> metric overview, the <u>Relative Proficiency Performance</u> values are calculated by subject and school year for each Wyoming school.
- 2. **Performance Trend Value**: A three year performance trend value (linear regression slope) is then calculated for each school.
 - a. A positive <u>Performance Trend Values</u> indicates that a school has a positive three year performance trend (performance is increasing). Likewise, a negative value indicates a decreasing performance trend. The higher the Performance Trend Value, the larger the relative three year performance gain trend, and vice-versa.
 - b. <u>Performance Trend Value</u> figures are then ranked. The higher the figure the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the figure, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Overall ranking of schools for identification of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" then takes place for two groupings: all-schools, and by-school-category (secondary schools, etc.)

- 1. **School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking**: The average of the four calculated <u>Academic Achievement</u> and <u>Progress</u> rankings:
 - a. Math Academic Achievement Ranking
 - b. Reading Academic Achievement Ranking
 - c. Math Progress Ranking
 - d. Reading Progress Ranking
- 2. Methodology remains the same across the four component rankings and the final <u>School Academic</u>
 <u>Achievement and Progress Ranking</u> in that the higher the ranking, the lower the performance and the greater the need for improvement.

 $\frac{APPENDIX\ B}{\text{Wyoming's Identified Tier I, II, and III Schools}}$

District	NCES Agency ID#	School	NCES School ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
Albany #1	5600730	Velma Linford Elementary	00014			X		
		Whiting High School	00066		X			
Big Horn #4	5601090	Riverside High School	00036			X		X
Campbell #1	5601470	Rawhide Elementary	00071			X		X
		Lakeview Elementary	00070			X		X
Carbon #1	5601030	Cooperative High School	00147	X			X	
		Rawlins Middle School	00028			X		X
		Pershing Elementary	00033	X				
		Mountain View Elementary	00032			X		X
Carbon #2	5601700	HEM Junior/Senior High School	00385		X			
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Primary School	00128			X		
		Douglas Intermediate School	00352			X		
		Moss Agate Elementary	130			X		X
Converse #2	5602150	Glenrock High School	00137		X			
Crook #1		Hulett School	00458			X		X
Fremont #1	5602870	Pathfinder High School	00154	X			X	
		North Elementary	00199			X		
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Elementary School	00226	X				
		Wyoming Indian Middle School	00386	X				
		Wyoming Indian High School	00441			X		X
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Charter High School	00354	X			X	
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni Junior High School	00510			X		X
		Shoshoni High School	00323			X		X
Fremont #25	5605220	Aspen Park Elementary	00292			X		X
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Elementary	00162	X				
		Arapaho Charter High School	00367	X			X	
Goshen #1	5602990	Trail Elementary	00488			X		X
Johnson #1	5603770	Kaycee High School	00188			X		X
Laramie #1	5601980	Triumph High School	00092		X		X	
		Johnson Junior High School	00094			X		
		Pioneer Park Elementary	00118			X		X
Lincoln #2	5604060	Swift Creek Learning Center	00193		X		X	
Natrona #1	5604510	Frontier Middle School	00374			X		
		Mountain View Elementary School	00248	X				
		Roosevelt High School	00256		X		X	

		2010 2013						
District	NCES Agency ID #	School	NCES School ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Middle School	00215			X		X
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater Junior High School	00509			X		X
Platte #2	5603180	Guernsey-Sunrise Junior High	00499			X		X
Sublette #9	5601260	Big Piney Elementary	00043			X		X
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Lincoln Elementary	00299			X		X
		Rock Springs High School	00294			X		X
		Desert View Elementary	00298			X		
		Rock Springs East Junior High	00295			X		X
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Expedition Academy	00164		X		X	
		Truman Elementary	00425			X		X
Teton #1	5605830	Colter Elementary	00289			X		
		Jackson Elementary	00313			X		
		Summit High School	00512		X			
Uinta #1	5602760	Horizon Alternative School	00376		X			
		North Evanston Elementary	00433			X		
		Aspen Elementary	00462			X		
Uinta #4	5604500	Mountain View Middle School	00388			X		

Appendix C: WDE State System of Support Overview

- The Wyoming Department of Education's (WDE) theory of action to assist districts/schools in the educational improvement process is called the State System of Support (SSoS) and 2009-2010 will be the pilot year of implementation. WDE is providing direction and leadership in more data-driven decision making. WDE is focusing on building capacity at the district-level to enable districts to better assist their schools.
- WDE is refocusing manpower to provide new services to districts/schools and is providing training/professional development to WDE personnel to help implement the new SSoS.
- WDE is implementing a systems-based operations approach (based on the Baldrige Management System) and several districts are piloting the same type of systems approach. WDE is focusing on accountability by improving customer service and having more effective and efficient operations.
- WDE is also providing leadership and on-site visits to several districts in the systems-based approach called
 Organizational Assessment—essentially the Baldrige System with curriculum and instruction added to the criteria.
- Every Wyoming school district has a WDE District Consultant or District Coach assigned as their primary point of contact at WDE. In addition to District Consultants/Coaches, WDE is continuing to have WDE regional contacts.
 - The District Consultant/Coach will go onsite at a district at least once a year.
 - The District Consultant/Coach will provide other types of contact throughout the year, i.e., emails, telephone calls, and electronic interaction such as WEN video, etc.
 - Every district/school that did not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) will be provided additional assistance.
 - For districts that are assigned a Coach and need more assistance from WDE, a WDE oversight team will be created to give more in-depth district support.
- A Toolkit/Notebook will be provided to every district. The Toolkit contains information regarding WDE
 programs/projects/initiatives, WDE contact information, and educational best-practices and research-based
 program access information.
- WDE is in partnership with AdvancEd (formerly North Central Accreditation Association) regarding district/school
 accreditation and district monitoring for compliance with state statutes/rules. SSoS is not only focusing on the
 monitoring process but also on providing technical assistance for those areas that are not in compliance and/or
 areas that need to be improved.
- WDE is providing direction and leadership in linking student academic achievement and the certified personnel performance appraisal system as outlined in the revisions of the Chapter 29 Rules.
- WDE is providing technical assistance and professional development to districts to help achieve the Wyoming Public Education and WDE student-focused goals.

For more information, please contact Kay Post at 307.777.3498, kpost@educ.state.wy.us or Joy Mockelmann at 307.777.8712, jmocke@educ.state.wy.us.

Appendix D: Implementation Timelines

Appendix E: Waiver Request Documentation and Comments

Link to Memorandum: Memo. No. 2010-025: Title I 1003 g School Improvement Funds Waiver Requests http://www.k12.wy.us/A/supt_memos/2010/2010_025.pdf

MEMORANDUM NO: 2010-025

TO: School District Superintendents

FROM: Brian Wright, Title I Program Director

Federal Programs Unit

DATE: February 5, 2009

SUBJECT: Title I 1003 g School Improvement Funds Waiver Requests

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

The Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) is in the process of completing an application for 1003 g School Improvement Funds with the US Department of Education (USED. Within this application, the WDE can request to waive certain requirements associated with these funds. The Wyoming Department of Education will be submitting the waiver requests and are required to provide all Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in Wyoming with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on these requests.

The waivers the WDE will be requesting are as follows:

- Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The section of the application detailing the waiver requests is attached to this memo.

On February 2, 2010, the WDE began notifying stakeholders of these waiver requests by announcements at meetings, via e-mail and followed with this Superintendents Memo. Copies of all comments that the WDE receives from LEAs in response to this notice will be compiled and attached to the waiver requests. Public comment will be accepted until close of business on February 12, 2010. If you wish to make public comments on any of these waiver requests, please feel free to contact me, Brian Wright, State Title I Director, at 307-

777-5792 or bwrigh@educ.state.wy.us. All public comments will be compiled and submitted to the US Department of Education with these waiver requests.

Thank you for your time and consideration.	
Attachment	

BW:

Wyoming requests a waiver of the requirements it has listed below. These waivers would allow any local educational agency (LEA) in the State that receives a School Improvement Grant to use those funds in accordance with the final requirements for School Improvement Grants and the LEA's application for a grant.

The State believes that the requested waiver(s) will increase the quality of instruction for students and improve the academic achievement of students in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools by enabling an LEA to use more effectively the school improvement funds to implement one of the four school intervention models in its Tier II schools and to carry out school improvement activities in its Tier III schools. The four school intervention models are specifically designed to raise substantially the achievement of students in the State's Tier I and Tier II schools.

- ✓ Waive section 421(b) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. § 1225(b)) to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds for the SEA and all of its LEAs to September 30, 2013.
- ✓ Waive section 1116(b) (12) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to allow their Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools that will implement a turnaround or restart model to "start over" in the school improvement timeline.
- ✓ Waive the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold in section 1114(a)(1) of the ESEA to permit LEAs to implement a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the poverty threshold.

The State assures that it will ensure that any LEA that chooses to implement one or more of these waivers will comply with section II.A.8 of the final requirements.

The State assures that it will permit an LEA to implement the waiver(s) only if the LEA receives a School Improvement Grant and requests to implement the waiver(s) in its application. As such, the LEA may only implement the waiver(s) in Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools, as applicable, included in its application.

The State assures that, prior to submitting this request in its School Improvement Grant application, the State provided all LEAs in the State that are eligible to receive a School Improvement Grant with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on this request and has attached a copy of that notice as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs. The State also assures that it provided notice and information regarding this waiver request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its Web site) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice.

The State assures that, if it is granted one or more of the waivers requested above, it will submit to the U.S. Department of Education a report that sets forth the name and NCES District Identification Number for each LEA implementing a waiver, including which specific waivers each LEA is implementing.

Public Comment on the Wyoming Department of Education's Waiver Requests:

Comment from Brent Walker, Principal and member of the Wyoming's Committee of Practitioners, Park CSD #1, Powell, WY via e-mail on February 2, 2010:

Brian, I feel that the 40% waiver would be very important. In my case, 3 or 4 kids can make the difference. With all the \$ coming into the state right now, the extension of time to use these funds would be a good idea.

Comment from Dianne Frazer, District Support and Coordination Team, Wyoming Department of Education, Cheyenne, WY via e-mail on February 2, 2010:

Hi Brian,

I see no problem with applying for all of these waivers. If I understand them correctly, the waivers provide additional time, incentive, and broader opportunities.

Comment from Peg Brown-Clark, Director – Special Programs Unit, Wyoming Department of Education, Cheyenne, WY via e-mail on February 2, 2010:

Sorry for the late response...I would certainly ask for all the waivers!! That would be a win for schools and districts!!

Comment from Dr. Laurel Ballard, Chief Information and Data Officer, Wyoming Department of Education, Cheyenne, WY via e-mail on February 3, 2010:

Hi Brian,

I am good with asking for all of these waivers. The only one that would impact AYP would be the second waiver. I believe if a school implements a turnaround or restart model, the school be allowed to start the school improvement cycle with a clean slate. If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Comment from Owen Lampert, Principal and member of the Wyoming's Committee of Practitioners, Fremont CSD #25, Riverton, WY via e-mail on February 3, 2010:

Brian,

I support the waiver requests as written.

Owen

Comment from Kay Post, Director – Educational Quality and Accountability Unit, Wyoming Department of Education, Cheyenne, WY via e-mail on February 2, 2010:

Brian,

I agree with Laurel—I do not see any problem with asking for all of these waivers.

Comment from Betsy Sell, Assistant Superintendent, Park CSD #6, Cody, WY via e-mail on February 9, 2010 with response from Brian Wright, State Title I Director on February 11, 2010:

Brian,

Could you respond to these questions please. I think I know the answers, but would rather hear them from you.

Thanks,

Betsy

When it mentions "restarting" would that start next year? Yes, after the specific intervention the schools picks is implemented.

What does restart mean? It refers to a schools starting over as a charter school, under a charter school management company or a educational management company

Also, would this mean that both Sunset and Livy would be eligible for schoolwide Title 1 if it is

approved? If they qualify as a Persistently Lowest-Achieving school.

Does the amount of funding increase if all the schools are considered "schoolwide"? No-same allocation

Would the other schools need to complete a School Improvement Plan? *Not sure what you mean by this?*

Comment from Suzanne Martin, Title I Coordinator and member of the Wyoming's Committee of Practitioners, Sweetwater CSD #1, Rock Springs, WY via e-mail on February 10, 2010:

Brian.

Sorry it took me so long to get back to you on this. I'm not sure I have a good enough understanding of long term implications to be able to give high quality input, but here's my current thinking regarding the waivers.

- # 1. This seems like a good idea, especially in light of the stimulus funds that overlap with the original time frame and the uncertainty of future funding.
- #2. This is the waiver I feel I need more information on. If I were at a Tier 1 or Tier 2 school, I would love the opportunity to start over. It would allow the school to focus time and energy on things other than school choice and SES. On the other hand, I wonder if there are benefits to having some of the consequences associated with the school improvement timeline. I also would like to know more about the success rates with the turnaround or restart models. I'm wondering about the schools that are stuck with the consequences and don't have the opportunity to start over as they implement a turnaround or restart model because they don't qualify for the 1003 g funds—although I also don't know if this really matters or not.
- #3. I think this waiver is an excellent idea. I think the opportunity to go schoolwide allows schools to make better use of their funds. If they are trying to improve student achievement in significant ways, I think it would be difficult to do if they can only use the 1003 g funds for identified students.

For what it's worth, hope this is helpful.

Suzanne

All public comment was compiled by Brian Wright, Wyoming State Title I Director

Appendix F: LEA School Improvement Application LEA Application was submitted as a separate document.

Appendix G: USED Feedback and WDE Response

Please Note: WDE Responses are in italics.

SEA RECEIVED AN APPROVED PLA DEFINITIONED IS FINALIZING THE WYOMING PLA DEFINITION

The WDE has received final approval on their PLA Definition. A copy of this definition and the identified schools have been included in this update to the SEA Application – please see Appendix A and B

The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether the LEA has demonstrated that it has the capacity to use SIG funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application in order to implement fully and effectively the selected intervention in each of those schools

The SEA states that the SWSOS will provide technical assistance to help with needs assessment and to help determine if a school can implement a particular model. A Description of how these factors interact to determine LEA capacity needs to be more clear. Additionally, page 16 of the SEA application indicates that the SWSOS will help only if needed.

LEAs are best suited to determine the needs of their individual schools. Several Wyoming LEAs have already conducted a needs assessment or Organizational Assessment (OA) to determine what the needs of the LEA systems. Because of this, the WDE SoSS will provide technical assistance by conducting an abbreviated OA if it is needed, or will arrange for an extensive OA by an outside evaluator.

The SEA has described, with specificity, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether the LEA's budget includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application as well as to support school improvement activities in Tier III schools throughout the period of availability of those funds The SEA states that LEAs must submit proposed budgets by specific categories related to the

implementation of each model. See page 7 of application and pg. 21 – 23 of LEA application. However, the criteria the SEA will use to evaluate whether the LEAs budget is sufficient was not included. Additional information is required. In addition, Under school closure in the application is a line item for "civil rights considerations." What does this mean?

Additional criteria has been added, please see Appendix E of the LEA Application, Budget Section – page 64.

Civil Rights Considerations are taken directly from the SIG Handbook provided by the Center for Innovation and Improvement. An area of funding was added to account for any additional funding or activities that would relate to civil rights considerations that could arise from the closing of a school and the moving of students.

The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality.

Application does not appear to address the SEA review criteria, However, see page 12 of LEA application for examples of the type of information that an LEA would provide as evidence that it has a process for how it will select external providers. If these are the criteria the SEA will review it needs to be specifically stated

The LEA will need to a detailed explanation of the rigorous review process they will use to select a CMO, EMO, or CSO. In their description, the LEA will need to take into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability. Review of this process has been added to the rubric found in Appendix E of the LEA Application, Intervention Models – Required Elements section – page 56.

The SEA has described how it will assess the LEA's commitment to align other resources with the interventions.

Page 5 of LEA application has a list of programs under the heading "Additional Resources" but it is not clear what the categories for each program mean or how the information an LEA must provides relates to the implementation of a particular model. Page 6 requires LEA to provide a detailed explanation of how existing programs, funding sources and partnerships will support model implementation. However there is no indication how the SEA will evaluate this.

Additional directions have been added for the LEAs. These additional resources should be considered for activity funding and budgeting and will be evaluated within those areas. This will not be an additional area of evaluation because not all LEAs have these additional resources. This is used in conjunction with the needs assessment to determine what the resources the school already has in place and how these funds can be used to improve or augment these additional resources. See the LEA application, Needs Assessment section – pages 9-13 for changes.

The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively.

Wyo. Indicates that this component is "embedded" in the LEA application. Doesn't indicate "how" practices/policies, etc. be evaluated. See pg. 8 SEA Application. Do not see where it is clearly required under the Rubric, Appendix E.

Additional evaluation criteria has been added to the rubric, please see the LEA application, Appendix E – Action Plan – Modifying Policies and Practices section – page 60.

The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

LEA will be required to complete a "funding" study in year 3 of grant to indicate how it will sustain the reforms. It appears the "funding" study is not yet developed. This requirement must be addressed prior to the approval of LEAs applications.

Additional narrative added to the LEA application, page 13 under additional resources section of the needs assessment, as well as new narrative added to each Intervention Action Plan except to the Closure Model.

The SEA has described how it will evaluate whether an LEA lacks capacity to implement an intervention model in each of its Tier I schools.

Wyo. indicates that it is up to the LEA to indicate and provide evidence that it does not have capacity to implement a school intervention model, to be reviewed by a panel & the final determination made by the State Supt. It is uncertain how this decision will be made.

The LEA has the burden of proof to show that it lacks capacity to implement an intervention model in each of its Tier I schools. The factors to show it lacks capacity will be presented by the LEA and reviewed by a panel at the WDE – this panel will be comprised of various experts within the WDE, to include federal programs, fiscal/school finance, and members of the WDE SoSS. This panel will recommend to the Superintendent of Public Instruction whether or not the LEA lacks capacity based on whether or not the LEA has sufficiently proven that they lack capacity. The Superintendent of Public Instruction will provide the final determination based on the panels recommendation.

The SEA has explained what it will do if it determines that an LEA has more capacity than the LEA claims.

The application does not address this element.

If an LEA has tried to prove that they lack capacity and the final determination from the WDE is that they do have capacity, the LEA will be asked to meet the capacity requirements outlined within the LEA application and the final requirements from the USED. The LEA will be allowed to revise their current application if needed and will be given a sufficient amount of time to submit a new application for any Tier I school they may have. Other submitted applications from that LEA will be held until an application for a Tier I school has been submitted.

The LEA application requires the LEA to describe actions it has taken, or will take, to —

- Design and implement interventions consistent with the final requirements;
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
- Align other resources with the interventions;
- Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable its schools to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
- Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.

All components are included except for "how to sustain reforms after the funding" ends and Additional clarification needed. Intervention/Action plan does not appear to address how the LEA will modify its practices except under the transformation model.

Additional narrative has been added to address this – please see page 13 under additional resources section of the needs assessment, as well as new narrative added to each Intervention Action Plan except to the Closure Model.

The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to support school improvement activities, at the school or LEA level, for each Tier III school identified in the LEA's application.

There is no indication that the LEA has an opportunity to do this.

One application will be submitted for each school applying, so this application will be used for all Tiers. Tier III schools will use the same application and go through the same process, but they will be allowed more flexibility within the intervention model because they will not be required to implement all the required elements under the intervention model selected. Tier III school will be able to pick and choose what parts of the intervention model they wish to implement.

The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that does not exceed \$2 million per year multiplied by the number of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the LEA commits to serve.

The budget sheet indicates this item but it is not indicated in the LEA application.

Again, this application is for each school within, not for the LEA as a whole. Our Grants Management System, which this application will become a part of, will track how much each LEA will receive. Additional wording has been added to indicate how much a school can apply for – see page 15.

The LEA application requires an LEA to provide an assurance that it will establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the final requirements in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds, and establish goals (approved by the SEA) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds.

Assurance does not indicate annual goals.

The word "annual" has been added to the assurance covering this.

Additional Comment: SNS directions on page 3 of LEA application is not accurate. It should reflect the SNS requirements in section 1114.

This has been change and the wording from the USED Fiscal Non-Regulatory Guidance concerning Schoolwide Title I programs has been added.

Appendix H: USED Second Feedback and WDE Response

Please Note: WDE Responses are in *italics*.

WDF Responses

USED Feedback	WDL Kesponses
 The SEA has described how it will assess an LEA's commitment to sustain the reforms after the funding period ends. Feedback: No. WY indicates this has not been included within the application and will have to be reviewed as the grant cycle comes to an end. The year before the grant ends (beginning of the 2012-2013), the LEA/School must complete a funding study to determine how the LEA/School will sustain the reform efforts once funding ends in 2013. This data/analysis will be incorporated into the 	WDE is adding an additional requirement in the Intervention Questions after the Restart, Turnaround, And Transformation Models to incorporate results from a funding or impact study. This can be found on pages 21, 25, and 30 of the LEA application.

	2010-2013
 application at a later date so the information can be uploaded directly into the grant. However, LEA application (pg. 13) has a section that enables an LEA to provide narrative that describes strategies for sustain reform after the funds expire The LEA application requires an LEA to include a budget that indicates the amount 	
of SIG funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve Feedback: No. LEA application provides a budget template for LEA's overall SIG budget for each year. However, the LEA application does not indicate the need for a budget amount for each school that is receiving SIG funding.	In each school application that the LEA completes with the school, the budget pages and summary are calculated at the building level.
The LEA application requires an LEA to include a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year in each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school the LEA commits to serve Feedback: No. LEA application provides a budget template for LEA's overall SIG budget for each year. However, the LEA application does not indicate the need for a budget amount for each school that is receiving SIG funding	In each school application that the LEA completes with the school, the budget pages and summary are calculated at the building level.
The LEA application requires an LEA to provide a budget that indicates the amount of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to implement the selected model in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve. Feedback: No. LEA application provides a budget template for LEA's overall SIG budget for each year. Again the LEA application does not indicate how much is to be budgeted annually in each Tier I and Tier II school the LEA commits to serve. Although it is clear that an LEA must submit a separate application for each school it intends to serve, it is unclear if the budget on pages 29 – 32 of 65 is an LEA or school budget. A school-by-school budget is	Please see comment immediately above. Budget pages are school-by-school.

	2010-2013
required as is a budget showing LEA-level	
activities.	
The LEA application requires an LEA to	
provide a budget that indicates the amount	WDE is adding an additional activity in the
of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to	Intervention/Action Plan Tab of each model for
conduct LEA-level activities designed to	the specific LEA-level activities for each
support implementation of the selected	school. The budgeted amount will be part of
school intervention models in the LEA's	the Budget pages and then also included in the
Tier I and Tier II schools.	Budget summary page. This addition can be
Feedback:	found on pages 20, 24, and 28 of the LEA
No. Did not see information in the LEA	Application.
application package indicating the amount	
LEA will use for LEA-level support activities	
related to implementing the intervention	
models at schools participating in SIG.	
The LEA application requires an LEA to	
provide a budget that indicates the amount	Please see comment immediately
of SIG funds the LEA will use each year to	above.
support school improvement activities, at	
the school or LEA level, for each Tier III	
school identified in the LEA's application.	
Feedback:	
No. See comment immediately above.	
The LEA application requires an LEA to	
provide a budget that covers the full period	NA
of availability, including any extension	
granted through a waiver.	
Feedback:	
In the feedback document, this was blank	
The LEA application requires an LEA to	
provide a budget that does not exceed \$2	The LEA/school web application is
million per year multiplied by the number	designed in the budget pages and
of Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools the	budget summary pages to not allow
LEA commits to serve.	submission if the total is over
Feedback:	\$2,000,000 per year for the school.
No. See comment immediately above.	_ ,
Additional Note	The date the LEA application is due to
	Wde has been revised to July 12, 2010.
	·



Title I 1003 g School Improvement Funds

GRANT APPLICATION PACKET

for

2010-2013

Due July 12, 2010

Wyoming Department of Education Federal Programs Unit 2300 Capitol Avenue Hathaway Building, 1st Floor Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050

The Wyoming Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in its educational programs. Inquiries concerning Title VI, Title IX, Section 504, and the Americans With Disabilities Act may be referred to the Wyoming Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights Coordinator, 2nd floor, Hathaway Building, Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050 or (307) 777-5329, or the Office for Civil Rights, Region VII, US Department of Education, Federal Building, Suite 310, 1244 Speer Blvd., Denver, CO 80204-3582, or (303) 844-3417. This publication will be provided in an alternative form upon request.

GRANT GUIDELINES

PURPOSE

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status. Under the final requirements, as amended through the interim final requirements published in the Federal Register in January 2010 (final requirements, attached as Appendix C), school improvement funds are to be focused on each State's "Tier I" and "Tier II" schools. Tier I schools are a State's persistently lowest-achieving Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring and, if a State so chooses, certain Title I eligible elementary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier I schools. Tier II schools are a State's persistentlylowest achieving secondary schools (attached as Appendix A) that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I, Part A funds and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible secondary schools that are as low achieving as the State's other Tier II schools or that have had a graduation rate below 60 percent over a number of years. An LEA may also use school improvement funds in Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that are not identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools and, if a State so chooses, certain additional Title I eligible schools ("Tier III schools"). In the Tier I and Tier II schools an LEA chooses to serve, the LEA must implement one of four school intervention models: turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS AND CRITERIA FOR FUNDING

Eligibility for these funds will be based on the Tiered list developed from the WDE's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools definition. That list is housed on the WDE website and attached as Appendix C to this application.

The criteria is defined under the WDE's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools definition, see Appendix A for that definition.

SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS

As stated in the purpose of this grant, Tier I and II schools must implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of one (1) of the following USED School Intervention Models:

- **Closure Model** Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.
- **Restart Model** Convert a school or close and reopen it under a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.

- *Transformation Model* Implement each of the following strategies: (1) replace the principal and take steps to increase teacher and school leader effectiveness; (2) institute comprehensive instructional reforms; (3) increase learning time and create community-oriented schools; and (4) provide operational flexibility and sustained support.
- **Turnaround Model** Replace the principal and rehire no more than 50 percent of the staff, and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student outcomes.

The definition and requirements are further defined in the attached final requirements (Appendix C) under section I, A, 2

Tier III schools are also required to select one of these intervention models, but may modify the requirements to suit the needs of the schools. If modified, the LEA/School will need to describe the modifications and the reasoning behind the changes.

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the questions found in Appendix D of this application.

APPLICATION PROCEDURES AND SUBMISSION

- A <u>separate grant application</u> must be submitted by the district for <u>each school</u> applying for Title I 1003 g School Improvement Funds.
- A comprehensive needs assessment must be conducted by the LEA/School applying for this grant. All
 data utilized will need to be submitted and in a format that is readable and understandable by WDE
 Grant Reviewers. Data should be submitted in easy to read tables, either in Word or Excel. Narratives
 explaining the data and the conclusions reached. If possible, charts and graphs should be used.
- All sections must be completed only exception is that an LEA/School will only need to fill out the Intervention/Action Plan for the School Intervention Model the LEA/School has selected.
- Deadline for submission will be 12:00 am (midnight) M.S.T., June 30, 2010. This application will be submitted electronically via the WDE Grants Management System (GMS). Please contact the GMS Coordinator, Randal Butt, at 307-777-8739 to request access and establish a log in for this grant application.
- Please direct questions concerning this grant to:
 - Brian Wright,
 Wyoming Department of Education, Federal Programs Unit
 2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building, 1st Floor
 Cheyenne, WY 82002-0050
 - 0 307-777-5792
 - o bwrigh@educ.state.wy.us

REVIEW CRITERIA

Please see Appendix E for the rubric used for the evaluation of this grant.

SELECTION PROCESS

A review panel comprised of WDE staff will review all applications to verify that all required items are addressed and that the requested allocation is appropriate. WDE will make the final decisions concerning appropriate expenditures and budgets. Please note that submission of a grant application is not a guarantee that an LEA will receive a grant award.

PRIORITIZATION

Submission of a grant is not a guarantee that a LEA will receive – funding is limited and the amounts LEAs may request per year are significant, so the WDE may have to prioritize what grants get funded.

Priority funding will be given first to Tier I schools and then to Tier II schools. If further priority ranking is still needed, priority will be given to those schools that were identified for Tier I or Tier II based on their graduation rates. If further prioritization is needed, it will be based the ranking of the schools within each Tiered list (Appendix B of this application).

Priority funding will first be given to Tier III schools who are fully implementing all the required activities for one of the School Intervention Models as outline by the final requirements. After that, priority will be given to those Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status that were not identified in Tier I. Lastly, priority will be based on the ranking of the remaining Title I and Title I eligible schools within the Tier III list (Appendix B of this application).

PROJECT PERIOD/AWARD OF GRANTS

The Title I School Improvement grants will be awarded for a period of three (3) years starting on July 1, 2010 and ending June 30, 2013(assuming the USED approves the waiver request to extend the period of availability of these funds beyond September 30, 2011). An extension to September 30, 2013 may be requested during the last year of the grant period, but a detailed reasoning must be given as to why these funds should be extended to that date. All funds must be drawn. If any funds are not encumbered by June 30, 2013, the LEA will revert any unencumbered funds to the WDE for reallocation unless the LEA has requested an extension to September 30, 2013. All encumbered funds must be drawn down and spent by December 31, 2013.

Grant amounts will not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2 million per year for each participating school.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS (SUPPLEMENT-NOT SUPPLANT)

Because these School Improvement funds will be used as a Schoolwide Title I program, the participating school is not required to select and provide supplemental services to specific children identified as in need of services. A school operating a schoolwide program does not have to: (1) show that Federal funds used with the school are paying for additional services that would not otherwise be provided; (2) demonstrate that Federal funds are used only for specific target populations; or (3) separately track Federal program funds once they reach the school. A schoolwide program school, however, must use Title I funds only to supplement the amount of funds that would, in the absence of the Title I funds, be made available from non-Federal sources

for that school, including funds needed to provide services that are required by law for children with disabilities and children with limited English proficiency. [Section1114(a)(2)]

EVALUATION

LEAs will be required to revise and update their grant application each year by June 30 during the Grant Renewal. At that time, the LEA/School will update the current application, strategies, timelines, and budgets. The LEA/School will also be required to upload data and analysis to support whether or not the school has met their goals and/or making progress on their leading indicators. A section will also be built into the application to capture and report required data for the USED as outlined by the final requirements (see Appendix C of this application).

Because PAWS data is not available until July, the LEA will be required to select an additional indicator to measure student achievement. This data should be from a source that is available so the LEA can submit that data by June 30. LEAs will be asked to submit PAWS data and analysis by October 1.

If the LEA has not completed the necessary updates, data reviews, and reporting, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds from this grant until those requirements have been met. Likewise, if PAWS data has not been uploaded and analyzed by October 1, the LEA/School will not be able to request funds until that data has been submitted.

Data will be reviewed by an independent reviewer hired by the WDE and evaluated as to whether or not the school has met their goals and/or is making progress on their leading indicators. Initial approval to continue with the grant will be given by the reviewer, with the assumption that PAWS data will be uploaded by October 1. The reviewer also can request any clarifications on the data submitted at this time. Upon review of all the data, the reviewer will report their findings to the WDE and give a recommendation as to whether to renew the grant, give conditional approval for an additional year based on meeting goals and/or making progress, or cancel the grant based on the LEA/School not meeting their goals and making progress, or for not fully and efficiently implementing the grant as is written.

WDE Approval/Date	Total Amount Awarded \$

LEA and SCHOOL INFORMATION

_					_
	г	- ^	1.45	rma	4:
Δ		- 4	INTO	rma	TIAN

LEA Name and NCE	S ID Number:											
Name and Title of I	LEA Contact for Gra	ant Appl	lica	ition:								
Address:								Telep	hone	N	lumber:	
City:								Zip:				
Email Address:												
Authorized District	Signature (Superin	ntenden	t oi	r Desig	gn	ee)		Date				
School Informa	tion											
School Name and N	ICES ID Number:											
Name of School Pri	ncipal:											
Address:							Te	lephon	e Nur	nk	ber:	
City:							Zi	p:				
Email Address:												
Grade Span:	Poverty Rate:				(Current (Gra	duation	Rate	2:		
					Ti	tle I Stat	us:					
	Title I Schoo	olwide So	chc	ool		Title I	Tar	geted A	ssista	nc	ce School	
	Title I Eligib	le Schoo	1 <i>(p</i>	olease (de	escribe h	ow	you are	eligi	ble	e)	
	10.40		Sc	 I		provem	ent				T., _	
Check All That	N/A – Made	e AYP		Warn Year		ng Year		Year 1			Year 2	سمامانا
Apply:	Year 3			Year	4	Tier:		Year 5			Year 6 -	Higher
	Tier I			Tier II	ı	TICI.		Tier III				
	Intervention	on Selec	tec	d (Requ	ui	red for T	ier		Optio	na	al for Tier	III):
	Closure	Rest			_	Transfori					naround	
Building Principal	's Signature							Date				

ASSURANCES

For schools in School Improvement, I hereby certify that this plan was developed with the assistance of a LEA Coach
and/or District Support and Coordination Team Member, as applicable, in collaboration with the School
Improvement Team.

- I hereby certify that this plan was designed to improve student achievement with input from all stakeholders.
- □ I assure that the school-level personnel, including subgroup representatives responsible for implementation of the interventions outlined in this application, have collaborated in the completion of this application.
- □ I hereby certify that this plan has all of the following components:
 - Evidence of the use of a comprehensive needs assessment, which should include all necessary data analysis;
 - An action plan to implement one of the School Intervention Models as outline by the final regulations (Appendix B of this application);
 - Annual goals (implementation indicators);
 - Scientifically based research methods, strategies, and activities that guide curriculum content, instruction, and assessment;
 - Professional Development components aligned with assessed needs and School Intervention Model selected for implementation;
 - Family and community involvement activities aligned with assessed needs and School Intervention Model selected for implementation;
 - Evaluation strategies that include methods to measure progress of implementation;
 - Coordination of fiscal resources and analysis of school budget (possible redirection of funds); and
 - An action plan with timelines and specific activities for implementing the above criteria.
- □ I certify that the LEA will use its School Improvement Grant to implement fully and effectively an intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve consistent with the US Department of Education (USED) final requirements as outlined for 1003 g funds;
- I certify that the LEA will establish annual goals for student achievement on the Proficiency Assessment of Wyoming Students (PAWS) in both reading/language arts and mathematics and measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of the USED final requirements as outlined for 1003 g funds in order to monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that it serves with school improvement funds (approved by the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE)) to hold accountable its Tier III schools that receive school improvement funds;
- I certify that if the LEA implements a restart model in a Tier I or Tier II school, include in its contract or agreement terms and provisions to hold the charter operator, charter management organization, or educational management organization accountable for complying with the USED final requirements outlined for 1003 g funds;
- □ I certify to report to the WDE the school-level data required under section III of the USED final requirements outline for 1003 g funds;
- □ I further certify that the information contained in this assurance is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Superintendent's signature	Principal's signature
LEA Coach or District Support and Coordination Team Member	Chair, School Improvement Team

WAIVER REQUEST

The Wyoming Department of Education has requested the below waivers of requirements applicable to the Title I 1003 g School Improvement Application. It is assumed that an LEA completing this application will implement all of the requested waivers. If an LEA does not wish to implement one of these waivers, it must indicate which one of those waivers it does not intend to implement and why.

Please check each waiver that you do not wish to implement:

Extending the period of availability of school improvement funds.

Please Note: The WDE has requested a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds. If approved, that waiver automatically applies to all LEAs in Wyoming.

Reasoning as to why the LEA does not wish to implement this waiver:

"Starting over" in the school improvement timeline for Tier I and Tier II Title I participating schools implementing a turnaround or restart model.

Reasoning as to why the LEA does not wish to implement this waiver:

Implementing a schoolwide program in a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that does not meet the 40 percent poverty eligibility threshold.

Reasoning as to why the LEA does not wish to implement this waiver:

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The LEA/School will need to review the following to in order to complete a comprehensive needs assessment. This needs assessment should not only look at the needs of the student, but of staff and the community. Resources and partnerships that can help the LEA/School with their intervention should also be reviewed.

School Data Analysis

PAWS: Language Arts (percentage of students)

Grade		Below Basic			Basic			Proficient		Advanced			
Grade	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09		2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
11													

PAWS: Language Arts by Subgroup

Percentage of students scoring Below Basic and Basic (add together)

Grade		White Students			Native American Students			Hispanic Students			Other Ethnic Groups			Low SES			Students with Disabilities			English Language Learners		
	2006	2007 -08	2008	2008 2006 2007 200 -09 -07 -08 -09					2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	
3	07	00	03	- 07		03	07		05	07	- 00		07	00		- 07		03	- 07	00	- 03	
4																						
5																						
6																						
7																						
8																						
11																						

PAWS: Mathematics (percentage of students)

Grade	[Below Basio			Basic			Proficient		Advanced			
Grade	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
11													

PAWS: Mathematics by Subgroup

Percentage of students scoring Below Basic and Basic (add together)

Grade	Students				an		lispani tuden			ner Eth Group		L	ow SE	S		dents v sabiliti		English Language Learners			
	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 2007 2008 -07 -08 -09			2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09	2006 -07	2007 -08	2008 -09
3	-07	-08	-09	-07	-06	-09	-07	-06	-09	-07	-06	-09	-07	-06	-09	-07	-06	-09	-07	-06	-09
4																					
5																					
6																					
7																					
8																					
11																					

Please also provide data for MAP assessment and another rigorous LEA assessment.

Provide a brief description of your school, your attendance area, and your community.
List your school and LEA mission statement – how do they align?
Describe how the comprehensive needs assessment was conducted in an inclusive manner so it reaches all members of the school community (including regular education, special education, gifted and talented, migrant, students with limited English proficiency, etc. as well as low-achieving students), paying particular attention to the needs of educationally disadvantaged children.
Summarize (using data) the actual results of your needs assessment.
Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the current program for improving the education of low-achieving students.
Strengths
Weaknesses
As a result of the comprehensive needs assessment, what are the specific priority need areas for the school? (Please list in priority order 1, 2, 3, etc.)
What School Intervention Model will the school implement based on the comprehensive needs assessment? (This should be directly related to the priority need areas listed above)
Please explain how the LEA has the capacity to use these School Improvement Funds to provide adequate resources and related support to the school in order to implement, fully and effectively, the required activities of the school intervention model it has selected:
Explain how implementing this model will meet the needs of all the students in your school.
Please give a summary of input from relevant stakeholder group regarding the selection and implementation of a School Intervention Model (agendas, minutes, and sign-in sheets should be available from the LEA for review if needed):

Additional Resources

Please provide information on any additional funding sources the school may have available that can be use in conjunction with these School Improvement Funds.

Program List/Funding: (including during- and after-school programs)	Currently Using	No. of Years	Proposed Program	Deleted Program
Response to Intervention - IDEA and/or Title I Funds		_#_		
Professional Learning Communities		_#_		
Bridges Grant (either Extended Day or Year)		_#_		
Pre-School Program(s)		_#_		
Title I School Improvement Funds		_#_		
Title I-D, Subpart A		_#_		
Title II-A – Teacher/Leader Quality Partnership		_#_		
Title II-B - Math/Science Partnership		_#_		
Title II-D – Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant		_#_		
Title III – Services to English Language Learners		_#_		
McKinney-Vento Homeless Grant		_#_		
GEAR-UP		_#_		
Other: Click Here to Enter		_#_		
Other: Click Here to Enter		_#_		
Other: Click Here to Enter		<u>#</u>		
Other: Click Here to Enter		_#_		

List Su	upplemental Educational Services provided for your students (Title I schools in SI 2 and above):
•	Click Here to Enter
List th	ne Distance Learning (i.e., web-based, satellite) courses provided for your students:
•	Click Here to Enter

Please provide information on any additional partnerships the school may have available that can be use in conjunction with these School Improvement Funds.

School Partnerships (Type	e the name of each partner in the space provided)
University	Enter Partner name
Technical Institute	Enter Partner name
Feeder School(s)	Enter Partner name
Community	Enter Partner name
Business/Industry	Enter Partner name
Private Grants	Enter Partner name
Other	Enter Partner name

Please give a detailed explanation as to how the strategies selected will utilize the existing programs, funding sources, and partnerships listed
above:
Will these funding sources and partnerships be available when the funding for this grant has ended?

CAPACITY

If the LEA has Tier I schools and is applying to serve schools in other Tiers or only one Tier I school, the LEA must explain, in detail, why it lacks the capacity to serve each Tier I school.

If an LEA has one or more	In order to get 1003 g SI Funds, the LEA must commit to serve
Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III Schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school OR at least one Tier II school
Tier I and Tier II schools, but no Tier III schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school OR at least one Tier II school
Tier I and III schools, but no Tier II schools	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve; at a minimum, at least one Tier I school
Tier II and Tier III schools, but no Tier I schools	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II and Tier III schools as it wishes
Tier I Schools only	Each Tier I school it has capacity to serve
Tier II Schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier II schools as it wishes
Tier II Schools only	The LEA has the option to commit to serve as many Tier III schools as it wishes
Please give a detailed explanation as to why the LEA lacks the ca	pacity to serve Tier I or Tier II schools:

<u>INTERVENTIONS / ACTION PLAN – Information Page/No Response Needed</u>

A school in Tier I or Tier II must select one of the school intervention models and implement, fully and effectively, the required activities for that model.

A Tier III school must also select one of the intervention models, but may modify the required activities for that model. Schools in Tier III must give an explanation as to the reasoning to the modification. Priority funding will be given to Tier III schools who fully implement all the required activities for one of the school intervention models.

Please Note: The total LEA budget for each year must be at least \$50,000 and may not exceed \$2,000,000.

School Closure Model

Implementation Indicator:
Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):
Desired Outcomes (Objectives):
Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Full Implementation must occur in the 2010-2011 school year.

Activity	Person	Start Date	Key Milestones	Completion	Estimated Cost		
	Responsible		and Dates	Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 2013

Activity	Person	Start Date	Key Milestones	Completion	Estimated Cost		t
	Responsible		and Dates	Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013

Activity	Person	Start Date	Key Milestones	Completion	Estimated Cost			
	Responsible		and Dates	Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	
			Total	Cost by Year				

Specific Intervention Questions:

opositio intervention questioner
What higher achieving school or schools within the LEA will the students from the closed school be attending?
How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?
For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?
Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

School Restart Model

Implementation Indicator:
Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):
Desired Outcomes (Objectives):
Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Full Implementation must occur in the 2010-2011 school year.

CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership – please list any and all activities/cost associated with establishing and maintaining this partnership

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Responsible	and Dates	n Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
	Total (Cost by Year			
	Tota		Total Cost by Year Total Cost for All Activities by Year	·	·

Activity	Person Responsible	Key Milestones and Dates	Completio n Date	Estimated Cost			
				SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	
		Total	Cost by Year				

Specific Intervention Questions:

Please give a detailed explanation of the rigorous review process the LEA will use to select a CMO, EMO, or CSO (please take into consideration an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action and sustainability):

How will the school ensure enrollment, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school?

How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?

How will the LEA/School continue with the intervention and activities implemented after funding has ended Incorporating results/data from a funding study or impact study?

How will this intervention change the existing school? What direction will the new school take to change the policies and practices found within the old school?

For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?

Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

School Turnaround Model

<u>Please Note</u>: if implementing the School Turnaround Model, the LEA/School may also implement any of the required or permissible strategies under the School Transformation Model. If that is being done, please fill out the strategies selected in the School Transformation Model Action Plan.

implementation indicator:
Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):
Desired Outcomes (Objectives):
Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Full Implementation must occur in the 2010-2011 school year.

Teachers and Leaders – please list any and all activities/cost associated with principal replacement, review/select new school staff, and implement of recruitment/placement/retention strategies

Activity	Person	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
	Responsible				SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Instructional and Support Strategies – please list any and all activities/cost associated with the selection/implementation of an student needs based instruction model, providing job-embedded professional development designed to build the capacity/support of school staff, and to ensure continues use of data to inform/differentiate instruction

Activity	Person Sta Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Time and Support – please list any and all activities/cost associated with increased learning time for staff and students, and social-emotional/community-oriented services/support

Activity	Person Start Date	- 1	Completion	Estimated Cost			
	Responsible		and Dates	Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Governance - please list any and all activities/cost associated with a new governance structure

Activity	Person Start Responsible	Start Date	art Date Key Milestones and Dates	Completio n Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
				Cost by Year			
		Tota	Cost for All Activi	ties by Year			

Activity	Person	Start Date	Key Milestones	Completio	Estimated Cost		
	Responsible		and Dates	n Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 2013
			Total (Cost by Year			

Specific Intervention Questions:

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to review and select a new principal and staff for the school (please

note, the school may rehire no more than 50% of its existing staff):
What strategies will the LEA/School use to recruit, place and retain staff?
Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to select and implement an instructional model based on student needs:
Please give a detailed explanation as to how the LEA/School will evaluate job-embedded professional development to ensure that it is supporting and building the capacity of staff:
How will the school ensure use of data to inform and differentiate instruction?
How will the school increase learning time for staff and students?
How will the schools governance structure change?
How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?
How will the LEA/School continue with the intervention and activities implemented after funding has ended incorporating results/data from a funding study or impact study?
How will the policies and practices will within the school be modified due to the activities selected in this intervention?
For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?

Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

School Transformation Model

Implementation Indicator:
Implementation Indicator/Goal (must include student achievement on PAWS (both reading/language arts and math) in order to monitor the schools progress):
Desired Outcomes (Objectives):
Procedures for Evaluating Implementation Indicators:

Activities and Action Plan: Full Implementation must occur in the 2010-2011 school year.

Teachers and Leaders – please list any and all activities/cost associated with principal replacement, implementation of a new staff evaluation system, indentify/reward staff, and implementation of recruitment/placement/retention strategies

Activity	Person	Start Date	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
	Responsible		and Dates		SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Instructional and Support Strategies – please list any and all activities/cost associated with the selection/implementation of an student needs based instruction model, providing job-embedded professional development designed to build the capacity/support of school staff, and to ensure continues use of data to inform/differentiate instruction

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Time and Support – please list any and all activities/cost associated with increased learning time for staff and students, providing an ongoing mechanism for community/family engagement, and social-emotional/community-oriented services/support

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completion Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total	Cost by Year			

Governance – please list any technical assistance	and all activities/cost a	associated w	ith providing ope	erating flexil	bility and to e	ensure ongo	ning	
Activity	Person	n Start Date Key Milestones Completio Estimated (ost	
	Responsible		and Dates	n Date	SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013	
			Total (Cost by Year				
		Tota	l Cost for All Activi	,				

Activity	Person Responsible	Start Date	Key Milestones and Dates	Completio n Date	Estimated Cost		
					SY 2010 - 2011	SY 2011 - 2012	SY 2012 - 2013
			Total (Cost by Year			
		Tota	Cost for All Activi	ities by Year			

Specific Intervention Questions:

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to review and select a new principal:

Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to implement a new evaluation system:
How will the LEA /School ensure that it is developed with input from staff?
How will the LEA/School ensure the use of student growth as significant factor for this new evaluation system?
What strategies will the LEA/School use to recruit, place and retain staff?
Please give a detailed explanation of the process the LEA/School will use to select and implement an instructional model based on student needs:
Please give a detailed explanation as to how the LEA/School will evaluate job-embedded professional development to ensure that it is supporting and building the capacity of staff:
How will the school ensure use of data to inform and differentiate instruction?
How will the school increase learning time for staff and students?
How will the school ensure ongoing community and family engagement is provided?
How will the LEA ensure sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform?
How will the LEA ensure on-going technical assistance to this school? What will that technical assistance look like?
How will the LEA grant operating flexibility to the new school leader?

How will you consult with stakeholders concerning the implementation of this model?

How will the LEA/School continue with the intervention and activities implemented after funding has ended incorporating results/data from a funding study or impact study?

For Tier III Schools – how have you modified this School Intervention Model?

Please give a detailed explanation as to the reasoning behind the modification of this model:

BUDGET OVERVIEW (Please Note: The total LEA budget for each year must be at least \$50,000 and may not exceed \$2,000,000.)

School Year 2010-2011 (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011)

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
School Closure						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
School Restart						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
School Transformation						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
School Turnaround						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

School Year 2011-2012 (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012)

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
School Closure						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
School Restart						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
School Transformation						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
School Turnaround						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

School Year 2012-2013 (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013 - possible extension to September 30, 2013)

Strategies	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs
School Closure						
Closure						
Student Transfer						
Civil Rights Consideration						
School Restart						
CSO, CMO, or EMO Partnership						
Partnership Review						
School Transformation						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
School Turnaround						
Teachers and Leaders						
Instructional and Support Strategies						
Time and Support						
Governance						
Total Estimated Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

Total Estimated Grant Cost						
	100 Series	200 Series	300 Series	4000 Series	500 Series	Indirect Costs

REPORTING

For each school receiving 1003 g School Improvement Funds, the LEA will need to send the following data to the WDE (the means for collecting this data has not yet been determined by the WDE):

Metric	Currently Collected	New Requirement
School Data	Concocca	- riequirerrierre
LEA Name	Х	
NCES ID #	Х	
School Name	Х	
NCES ID #	Х	
Intervention Used		Х
Which AYP Targets Met and Missed	Х	
School Improvement Status	Х	
Number of Minutes within School Year		Х
Student Outcome/Academic Progress Data		
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency level on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics (<u>e.g.</u> , Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by grade and by student subgroup	х	
Student participation rate on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup	Х	
Average scale scores on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for the "all students" group, for each achievement quartile, and for each subgroup		Х
Percentage of limited English proficient students who attain English language proficiency	Х	
Graduation rate	Х	
Dropout rate	Х	
Student attendance rate	Х	
Number and percentage of students completing advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment classes		X (HS Only)
College enrollment rates		X (HS Only)
Student Connection and School Climate		, , ,,
Discipline incidents	Х	
Truants	Х	
Talent		

Distribution of teachers by performance level on LEA's teacher evaluation system	Х
Teacher attendance rate	Х

APPENDIX A

Defining and Identifying Wyoming's Tier I, II and III Schools

In an effort to blend State and Federal requirements and to create a unified comprehensive system for assisting persistently lowest-achieving schools, Wyoming has one definition and method of identifying Tier I, II, and III schools for School Improvement Grants and also for Race to the Top and State Fiscal Stabilization funding.

In the December 2009 School Improvement Grants Application for funding under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA):

School Improvement Grants, authorized under section 1003(g) of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Title I or ESEA), are grants, through State educational agencies (SEAs), to local educational agencies (LEAs) for use in Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that demonstrate the greatest need for the funds and the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to raise substantially the achievement of their students so as to enable the schools to make adequate yearly progress and exit improvement status.

Selecting schools eligible for funding requires that the SEA identify three levels of need described as Tier I, II, and III schools, the basis for the identification of those schools is as follows:

Identifying Tier I Schools

Tier I schools consist of the following:

Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that —

- 3. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the "all-students" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or
- 4. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier II Schools

Tier II schools consist of the following:

Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that —

3. Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive,

Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater, based the ranking of the "all-students" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; or

4. Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent two out of the last three years.

Identifying Tier III Schools

Tier III schools consist of the following:

Is any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; or

- 3. Is a Title I eligible school among the lowest quintile (20%) of performance based the ranking of the "all-students" group in reading and math on the School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking of all Wyoming Schools; and
- 4. Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' <u>Academic Achievement</u> (performance) on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

- 4. **Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade**: The statewide percentage of students testing proficient in each grade. All students tested in Wyoming public schools are included.
- 5. Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient: As testing for each grade level is independent of testing at other grade levels, the enrollment-by-grade makeup of each school must be taken into account to create a performance measure that will be valid for performance comparison of all Wyoming schools. To accomplish this need, the <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> values for each grade served by a school are averaged, weighted by the percentage of students enrolled in each grade served.
 - a. Examples:
 - i. Suppose that <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> is 50% for fourth grade and 60% for fifth grade.
 - ii. Example 1: A school serves only the fourth and fifth grades with enrollment of 50 fourth grade students and 50 fifth grade students.
 - 1. Half (50%) the students are enrolled in fourth grade, and half are enrolled in fifth grade.
 - 2. With equal enrollment weighting (half the 100 total students are in each grade), the weighted average target likewise becomes the halfway point between the fourth grade and fifth grade <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> values (50%)

and 60%, respectively). This halfway point, the <u>Weighted Average Statewide</u> <u>Percent Proficient</u>, is then 55%.

- a. Mathematically, this 55% weighted average is calculated as [(50 fourth grade students * 50% <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> for fourth grade) + (50 fifth grade students * 60% <u>Statewide Percent Proficient by Grade</u> for fifth grade)] divided by 100 students total enrolled in the school.
- iii. Example 2: A school serves only the fourth grade, with a total enrollment of 100 fourth grade students.
 - 1. With all 100 students enrolled in fourth grade, the <u>Statewide Percent Proficient</u> <u>by Grade</u> for fourth grade of 50% becomes the <u>Weighted Average Statewide</u> Percent Proficient for the school.
- 6. **Relative Proficiency Performance**: The comparative final metric, this is the difference between the percent of students proficient in a school and the <u>Weighted Average Statewide Percent Proficient</u> applicable to the school's particular enrollment-by-grade makeup.
 - a. <u>Relative Proficiency Performance</u> values are calculated as positive or negative percentages. The higher a positive percentage, the better a school's performance on current year testing. The lower a negative percentage, the more a school is in need of improvement.
 - b. <u>Relative Proficiency Performance</u> values are then ranked. The higher the percentage, the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the percentage, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Calculation of a valid comparative metric for Wyoming schools' <u>Progress</u> in performance on PAWS (Wyoming's state assessment) for each subject tested:

- 3. As described within Wyoming's <u>Academic Achievement</u> metric overview, the <u>Relative Proficiency Performance</u> values are calculated by subject and school year for each Wyoming school.
- 4. **Performance Trend Value**: A three year performance trend value (linear regression slope) is then calculated for each school.
 - a. A positive <u>Performance Trend Values</u> indicates that a school has a positive three year performance trend (performance is increasing). Likewise, a negative value indicates a decreasing performance trend. The higher the Performance Trend Value, the larger the relative three year performance gain trend, and vice-versa.
 - b. <u>Performance Trend Value</u> figures are then ranked. The higher the figure the lower the ranking, and the better the performance. The lower the figure, the higher the ranking, and the more improvement is needed.

Overall ranking of schools for identification of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" then takes place for two groupings: all-schools, and by-school-category (secondary schools, etc.)

- 3. **School Academic Achievement and Progress Ranking**: The average of the four calculated <u>Academic Achievement</u> and <u>Progress</u> rankings:
 - a. Math Academic Achievement Ranking
 - b. Reading Academic Achievement Ranking
 - c. Math Progress Ranking
 - d. Reading Progress Ranking
- 4. Methodology remains the same across the four component rankings and the final <u>School Academic</u> <u>Achievement and Progress Ranking</u> in that the higher the ranking, the lower the performance and the greater the need for improvement.

APPENDIX B

Wyoming's Identified Tier I, II, and III Schools

District	NCES Agency ID #	School	NCES School ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
Albany #1	5600730	Velma Linford Elementary	00014			Х		
		Whiting High School	00066		Χ			
Big Horn #4	5601090	Riverside High School	00036			Х		Х
Campbell #1	5601470	Rawhide Elementary	00071			Х		Х
		Lakeview Elementary	00070			X		X
Carbon #1	5601030	Cooperative High School	00147	X			Х	
		Rawlins Middle School	00028			X		X
		Pershing Elementary	00033	X				
		Mountain View Elementary	00032			X		Х
Carbon #2	5601700	HEM Junior/Senior High School	00385		X			
Converse #1	5602140	Douglas Primary School	00128			X		
		Douglas Intermediate School	00352			X		
		Moss Agate Elementary	130			Х		Х
Converse #2	5602150	Glenrock High School	00137		Х			
Crook #1		Hulett School	00458			Х		Х
Fremont #1	5602870	Pathfinder High School	00154	X			Х	
		North Elementary	00199			X		
Fremont #14	5604450	Wyoming Indian Elementary School	00226	X				
		Wyoming Indian Middle School	00386	X				
		Wyoming Indian High School	00441			X		X
Fremont #21	5602820	Ft. Washakie Charter High School	00354	X			Х	
Fremont #24	5605700	Shoshoni Junior High School	00510			X		X
		Shoshoni High School	00323			X		X
Fremont #25	5605220	Aspen Park Elementary	00292			X		X
Fremont #38	5600960	Arapahoe Elementary	00162	X				
		Arapaho Charter High School	00367	X			X	
Goshen #1	5602990	Trail Elementary	00488			Х		Х
Johnson #1	5603770	Kaycee High School	00188			Х		Х
Laramie #1	5601980	Triumph High School	00092		Х		Х	
		Johnson Junior High School	00094			Х		
		Pioneer Park Elementary	00118			Х		Х
Lincoln #2	5604060	Swift Creek Learning Center	00193		Х		Х	
Natrona #1	5604510	Frontier Middle School	00374			Х		

District	NCES Agency ID #	School	NCES School ID #	Tier I	Tier II	Tier III	Grad Rate	Newly Eligible
		Mountain View Elementary School	00248	X				
		Roosevelt High School	00256		X		X	
Niobrara #1	5604230	Lusk Middle School	00215			X		X
Platte #1	5605090	Chugwater Junior High School	00509			X		Х
Platte #2	5603180	Guernsey-Sunrise Junior High	00499			X		Х
Sublette #9	5601260	Big Piney Elementary	00043			Х		Х
Sweetwater #1	5605302	Lincoln Elementary	00299			Х		Х
		Rock Springs High School	00294			Х		Х
		Desert View Elementary	00298			Х		
		Rock Springs East Junior High	00295			Х		Х
Sweetwater #2	5605762	Expedition Academy	00164		Х		Χ	
		Truman Elementary	00425			Х		Х
Teton #1	5605830	Colter Elementary	00289			Х		
		Jackson Elementary	00313			Х		
		Summit High School	00512		Х			
Uinta #1	5602760	Horizon Alternative School	00376		Х			
		North Evanston Elementary	00433			Х		
		Aspen Elementary	00462			Χ		
Uinta #4	5604500	Mountain View Middle School	00388			Χ		

APPENDIX C

Final Requirements for School Improvement Grants, as Amended in January 2010

I. SEA Priorities in Awarding School Improvement Grants:

- A. <u>Defining key terms</u>. To award School Improvement Grants to its LEAs, consistent with section 1003(g)(6) of the ESEA, an SEA must define three tiers of schools, in accordance with the requirements in paragraph 1, to enable the SEA to select those LEAs with the greatest need for such funds. From among the LEAs in greatest need, the SEA must select, in accordance with paragraph 2, those LEAs that demonstrate the strongest commitment to ensuring that the funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable the lowest-achieving schools to meet the accountability requirements in this notice. Accordingly, an SEA must use the following definitions to define key terms:
 - 1. <u>Greatest need</u>. An LEA with the greatest need for a School Improvement Grant must have one or more schools in at least one of the following tiers:
 - (a) Tier I schools:
 - (i) A Tier I school is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(1) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."
 - (ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier I school an elementary school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)

- (1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; or
- (2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and
- (B) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(1)(i) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."

(b) Tier II schools:

- (i) A Tier II school is a secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds and is identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools."
- (ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier II school a secondary school that is eligible for Title I,
 Part A funds that--

(A)

- (1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two consecutive years; or
- (2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(B)

- (1) Is no higher achieving than the highest-achieving school identified by the SEA under paragraph (a)(2)(i) of the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools;" or
- (2) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(c) Tier III schools:

(i) A Tier III school is a Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

(ii) At its option, an SEA may also identify as a Tier III school a school that is eligible for Title I, Part A funds that--

(A)

- (1) Has not made adequate yearly progress for at least two years; or
- (2) Is in the State's lowest quintile of performance based on proficiency rates on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and
- (B) Does not meet the requirements to be a Tier I or Tier II school.
- (iii) An SEA may establish additional criteria to use in setting priorities among LEA applications for funding and to encourage LEAs to differentiate among Tier III schools in their use of school improvement funds.
- 2. <u>Strongest Commitment</u>. An LEA with the strongest commitment is an LEA that agrees to implement, and demonstrates the capacity to implement fully and effectively, one of the following rigorous interventions in each Tier I and Tier II school that the LEA commits to serve:
 - (a) Turnaround model:
 - (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--
 - (i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;
 - (ii) Using locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,
 - (A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and
 - (B) Select new staff;
 - (iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;
 - (iv) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;
 - (v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;
 - (vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;
 - (vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;
 - (viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.
 - (2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as--
 - (i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or
 - (ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).
 - (b) Restart model: A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education

management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

- (c) School closure: School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.
- (d) Transformation model: A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:
 - (1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
 - (B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--
 - (1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high school graduations rates; and
 - (2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
 - (C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
 - (D) Provide staff ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
 - (E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.
 - (ii) <u>Permissible activities</u>. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--
 - (A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
 - (B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
 - (C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.
 - (2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and vertically aligned from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and

- (B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.
- (ii) <u>Permissible activities</u>. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--
 - (A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
 - (B) Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;
 - (C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
 - (D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
 - (E) In secondary schools--
 - (1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement; International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), earlycollege high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
 - (2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
 - (3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, reengagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
 - (4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.
- (3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.
 - (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Establish schedules and strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
 - (B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.
 - (ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--
 - (A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;
 - (B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
 - (C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
 - (D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.
- (4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

- (i) Required activities. The LEA must--
 - (A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
 - (B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).
- (ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--
 - (A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
 - (B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

3. Definitions.

Increased learning time means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects including English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects. Persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State--

(a)

(1) Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

- (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or
- (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and
- (2) Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--
 - (i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or
 - (ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.
- (b) To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both--
 - (i) The academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

mpr.com/publications/redirect PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296>

¹ Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. "The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School." Child Development. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in school and out of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.) http://www.mathematica-

(ii) The school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.

<u>Student growth</u> means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student's score on the State's assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

- 4. Evidence of strongest commitment.
 - (a) In determining the strength of an LEA's commitment to ensuring that school improvement funds are used to provide adequate resources to enable Tier I and Tier II schools to improve student achievement substantially, an SEA must consider, at a minimum, the extent to which the LEA's application demonstrates that the LEA has taken, or will take, action to--
 - (i) Analyze the needs of its schools and select an intervention for each school;
 - (ii) Design and implement interventions consistent with these requirements;
 - (iii) Recruit, screen, and select external providers, if applicable, to ensure their quality;
 - (iv) Align other resources with the interventions;
 - (v) Modify its practices or policies, if necessary, to enable it to implement the interventions fully and effectively; and
 - (vi) Sustain the reforms after the funding period ends.
 - (b) The SEA must consider the LEA's capacity to implement the interventions and may approve the LEA to serve only those Tier I and Tier II schools for which the SEA determines that the LEA can implement fully and effectively one of the interventions.
- B. Providing flexibility.
 - 1. An SEA may award school improvement funds to an LEA for a Tier I or Tier II school that has implemented, in whole or in part, an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a), 2(b), or 2(d) of these requirements within the last two years so that the LEA and school can continue or complete the intervention being implemented in that school.
 - 2. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary of the requirements in section 1116(b) of the ESEA in order to permit a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school implementing an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a) or 2(b) of these requirements in an LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. Even though a school implementing the waiver would no longer be in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, it may receive school improvement funds.
 - 3. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to enable a Tier I or Tier II Title I participating school that is ineligible to operate a Title I schoolwide program and is operating a Title I targeted assistance program to operate a schoolwide program in order to implement an intervention that meets the requirements under section I.A.2(a), 2(b), or 2(d) of these requirements.
 - 4. An SEA may seek a waiver from the Secretary to extend the period of availability of school improvement funds beyond September 30, 2011 so as to make those funds available to the SEA and its LEAs for up to three years
 - 5. If an SEA does not seek a waiver under section I.B.2, 3, or 4, an LEA may seek a waiver.
- II. Awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs:
 - A. LEA requirements.
 - 1. An LEA may apply for a School Improvement Grant if it receives Title I, Part A funds and has one or more schools that qualify under the State's definition of a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school.
 - 2. In its application, in addition to other information that the SEA may require--
 - (a) The LEA must--
 - (i) Identify the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve;

- (ii) Identify the intervention it will implement in each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve;
- (iii) Demonstrate that it has the capacity to use the school improvement funds to provide adequate resources and related support to each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve in order to implement fully and effectively one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements;
- (iv) Provide evidence of its strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements;
- (v) Include a timeline delineating the steps the LEA will take to implement the selected intervention in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in the LEA's application; and
- (vi) Include a budget indicating how it will allocate school improvement funds among the Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III schools it commits to serve.
- (b) If an LEA has nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools, the LEA may not implement the transformation model in more than 50 percent of those schools.
- 3. The LEA must serve each Tier I school unless the LEA demonstrates that it lacks sufficient capacity (which may be due, in part, to serving Tier II schools) to undertake one of these rigorous interventions in each Tier I school, in which case the LEA must indicate the Tier I schools that it can effectively serve. An LEA may not serve with school improvement funds awarded under section 1003(g) of the ESEA a Tier I or Tier II school in which it does not implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements.
- 4. The LEA's budget for each Tier I and Tier II school it commits to serve must be of sufficient size and scope to ensure that the LEA can implement one of the rigorous interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements. The LEA's budget must cover the period of availability of the school improvement funds, taking into account any waivers extending the period of availability received by the SEA or LEA.
- 5. The LEA's budget for each Tier III school it commits to serve must include the services it will provide the school, particularly if the school meets additional criteria established by the SEA.
- 6. An LEA that commits to serve one or more Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III schools that do not receive Title I, Part A funds must ensure that each such school it serves receives all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of the school improvement funds.
- 7. An LEA in which one or more Tier I schools are located and that does not apply to serve at least one of these schools may not apply for a grant to serve only Tier III schools.

8.

- (a) To monitor each Tier I and Tier II school that receives school improvement funds, an LEA must--
 - (i) Establish annual goals for student achievement on the State's assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics; and
 - (ii) Measure progress on the leading indicators in section III of these requirements.
- (b) The LEA must also meet the requirements with respect to adequate yearly progress in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA.
- 9. If an LEA implements a restart model, it must hold the charter school operator, CMO, or EMO accountable for meeting the final requirements.
- B. SEA requirements.
 - 1. To receive a School Improvement Grant, an SEA must submit an application to the Department at such time, and containing such information, as the Secretary shall reasonably require.

2.

- (a) An SEA must review and approve, consistent with these requirements, an application for a School Improvement Grant that it receives from an LEA.
- (b) Before approving an LEA's application, the SEA must ensure that the application meets these requirements, particularly with respect to--

- (i) Whether the LEA has agreed to implement one of the four interventions identified in section I.A.2 of these requirements in each Tier I and Tier II school included in its application;
- (ii) The extent to which the LEA's application shows the LEA's strong commitment to use school improvement funds to implement the four interventions by addressing the factors in section I.A.4(a) of these requirements;
- (iii) Whether the LEA has the capacity to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school identified in its application; and
- (iv) Whether the LEA has submitted a budget that includes sufficient funds to implement the selected intervention fully and effectively in each Tier I and Tier II school it identifies in its application and whether the budget covers the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waiver extending the period of availability received by either the SEA or the LEA.
- (c) An SEA may, consistent with State law, take over an LEA or specific Tier I or Tier II schools in order to implement the interventions in these requirements.
- (d) An SEA may not require an LEA to implement a particular model in one or more schools unless the SEA has taken over the LEA or school.
- (e) To the extent that a Tier I or Tier II school implementing a restart model becomes a charter school LEA, an SEA must hold the charter school LEA accountable, or ensure that the charter school authorizer holds it accountable, for complying with these requirements.
- 3. An SEA must post on its Web site, within 30 days of awarding School Improvement Grants to LEAs, all final LEA applications as well as a summary of those grants that includes the following information:
 - (a) Name and National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) identification number of each LEA awarded a grant.
 - (b) Amount of each LEA's grant.
 - (c) Name and NCES identification number of each school to be served.
 - (d) Type of intervention to be implemented in each Tier I and Tier II school.
- 4. If an SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to award, for up to three years, a grant to each LEA that submits an approvable application, the SEA must give priority to LEAs that apply to serve Tier I or Tier II schools.
- 5. An SEA must award a School Improvement Grant to an LEA in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to support the activities required under section 1116 of the ESEA and these requirements. The LEA's total grant may not be less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III school that the LEA commits to serve.
 - 6. If an SEA does not have sufficient school improvement funds to allocate to each LEA with a Tier I or Tier II school an amount sufficient to enable the school to implement fully and effectively the specified intervention throughout the period of availability, including any extension afforded through a waiver, the SEA may take into account the distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools among such LEAs in the State to ensure that Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State can be served.
- 7. An SEA must award funds to serve each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs commit to serve, and that the SEA determines its LEAs have the capacity to serve, prior to awarding funds to its LEAs to serve any Tier III schools. If an SEA has awarded school improvement funds to its LEAs for each Tier I and Tier II school that its LEAs commit to serve in accordance with these requirements, the SEA may then, consistent with section II.B.9, award remaining school improvement funds to its LEAs for the Tier III schools that its LEAs commit to serve.
- 8. In awarding School Improvement Grants, an SEA must apportion its school improvement funds in order to make grants to LEAs, as applicable, that are renewable for the length of the period of availability of the funds, taking into account any waivers that may have been requested and received by the SEA or an individual LEA to extend the period of availability.

- (a) If not every Tier I school in a State is served with FY 2009 school improvement funds, an SEA must carry over 25 percent of its FY 2009 funds, combine those funds with FY 2010 school improvement funds, and award those funds to eligible LEAs consistent with these requirements. This requirement does not apply in a State that does not have sufficient school improvement funds to serve all the Tier I schools in the State.
- (b) If each Tier I school in a State is served with FY 2009 school improvement funds, an SEA may reserve up to 25 percent of its FY 2009 allocation and award those funds in combination with its FY 2010 funds consistent with these requirements.
- 10. In identifying Tier I and Tier II schools in a State for purposes of allocating funds appropriated for School Improvement Grants under section 1003(g) of the ESEA for any year subsequent to FY 2009, an SEA must exlude from consideration any school that was previously identified as a Tier I or Tier II school and in which an LEA is implementing one of the four interventions identified in these requirements using funds made available under section 1003(g) of the ESEA.
- 11. An SEA that is participating in the "differentiated accountability pilot" must ensure that its LEAs use school improvement funds available under section 1003(g) of the ESEA in a Tier I or Tier II school consistent with these requirements.
- 12. Before submitting its application for a School Improvement Grant to the Department, the SEA must consult with its Committee of Practitioners established under section 1903(b) of the ESEA regarding the rules and policies contained therein and may consult with other stakeholders that have an interest in its application.
- C. Renewal for additional one-year periods.
 - (a) If an SEA or an individual LEA requests and receives a waiver of the period of availability of school improvement funds, an SEA--
 - (i) Must renew the School Improvement Grant for each affected LEA for additional one-year periods commensurate with the period of availability if the LEA demonstrates that its Tier I and Tier II schools are meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 and that its Tier III schools are meeting the goals established by the LEA and approved by the SEA; and
 - (ii) May renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant if the SEA determines that the LEA is making progress toward meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 or the goals established by the LEA.
 - (b) If an SEA does not renew an LEA's School Improvement Grant because the LEA's participating schools are not meeting the requirements in section II.A.8 or the goals established by the LEA, the SEA may reallocate those funds to other eligible LEAs, consistent with these requirements.
- D. State reservation for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance.

 An SEA may reserve from the school improvement funds it receives under section 1003(g) of the ESEA in any given year no more than five percent for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses. An SEA must describe in its application for a School Improvement Grant how the SEA will use these funds.
- E. A State Whose School Improvement Grant Exceeds the Amount the State May Award to Eligible LEAs. In some States in which a limited number of Title I schools are identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the SEA may be able to make School Improvement Grants, renewable for additional years commensurate with the period of availability of the funds, to each LEA with a Tier I, Tier II, or Tier III school without using the State's full allocation under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. An SEA in this situation may reserve no more than five percent of its FY 2009 allocation of school improvement funds for administration, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses under section 1003(g)(8) of the ESEA. The SEA may retain sufficient school improvement funds to serve, for succeeding years, each Tier I, II, and III school that generates funds for an eligible LEA. The Secretary may reallocate to other States any remaining school improvement funds from States with surplus funds.
- III. Reporting and Evaluation:
 - A. Reporting metrics.

To inform and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions identified in these requirements, the Secretary will collect data on the metrics in the following chart. The Department already collects most of these data through ED<u>Facts</u> and will collect data on two metrics through SFSF reporting. Accordingly, an SEA must only report the following new data with respect to school improvement funds:

- 1. A list of the LEAs, including their NCES identification numbers, that received a School Improvement Grant under section 1003(g) of the ESEA and the amount of the grant.
- 2. For each LEA that received a School Improvement Grant, a list of the schools that were served, their NCES identification numbers, and the amount of funds or value of services each school received.
- 3. For any Tier I or Tier II school, school-level data on the metrics designated on the following chart as "SIG" (School Improvement Grant):

Metric	Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
		SCHOOL DATA	
Which intervention the school used (i.e., turnaround,	NEW		
restart, closure, or transformation)	SIG		
AYP status	ED <u>Facts</u>	✓	
Which AYP targets the school met and missed	ED <u>Facts</u>	✓	
School improvement status	ED <u>Facts</u>	✓	
Number of minutes within the school year	NEW		✓
	SIG		
		OUTCOME/ACADEMIC P	ROGRESS DATA
Percentage of students at or above each proficiency	ED <u>Facts</u>	✓	
level on State assessments in reading/language arts and			
mathematics (<u>e.g.</u> , Basic, Proficient, Advanced), by			
grade and by student subgroup	EDFo et e		./
Student participation rate on State assessments in	ED <u>Facts</u>		•
reading/language arts and in mathematics, by student subgroup			
Average scale scores on State assessments in	NEW	✓	
reading/language arts and in mathematics, by grade, for	SIG	·	
the "all students" group, for each achievement quartile,	310		
and for each subgroup			
Percentage of limited English proficient students who	ED <u>Facts</u>	✓	
attain English language proficiency	<u> </u>		
Graduation rate	ED <u>Facts</u>	✓	
Dropout rate	ED <u>Facts</u>		✓
Student attendance rate	ED <u>Facts</u>		✓
Number and percentage of students completing	NEW		✓
advanced coursework (e.g., AP/IB), early-college high	SIG		
schools, or dual enrollment classes	HS only		
College enrollment rates	NEW	✓	
	SFSF Phase II		
	HS only		
		ECTION AND SCHOOL CL	
Discipline incidents	ED <u>Facts</u>		✓

Source	Achievement Indicators	Leading Indicators
ED <u>Facts</u>		✓
	TALENT	
NEW SFSF Phase II		✓
NEW		✓
	ED <u>Facts</u> NEW SFSF Phase II	Indicators EDFacts TALENT NEW SFSF Phase II NEW

4. An SEA must report these metrics for the school year prior to implementing the intervention, if the data are available, to serve as a baseline, and for each year thereafter for which the SEA allocates school improvement funds under section 1003(g) of the ESEA. With respect to a school that is closed, the SEA need report only the identity of the school and the intervention taken--<u>i.e.</u>, school closure.

B. Evaluation.

An LEA that receives a School Improvement Grant must participate in any evaluation of that grant conducted by the Secretary.

APPENDIX D

In planning for which School Intervention Model a LEA/School will implement, the LEA/School will first need to work through the questions below. These questions are to be used to help the LEA/School determine what School Intervention Model would be best for the school. These questions can also be used to help an LEA determine if they have the capacity to serve one or more Tier I or Tier II schools.

The Turnaround Model

- 1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
- 2. How will the LEA assign effective teachers and leaders to the lowest achieving schools?
- 3. How will the LEA begin to develop a pipeline of effective teachers and leaders to work in turnaround schools?
- 4. How will staff replacement be executed—what is the process for determining which staff remains in the school and for selecting replacements?
- 5. How will the language in collective bargaining agreements be negotiated to ensure the most talented teachers and leaders remain in the school?
- 6. What supports will be provided to staff being assigned to other schools?
- 7. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
- 8. What is the LEA's own capacity to execute and support a turnaround? What organizations are available to assist with the implementation of the turnaround model?
- 9. What changes in decision-making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the infusion of human capital?
- 10. What changes in operational practice must accompany the infusion of human capital, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

The Restart Model

- 1. Are there qualified CSO, CMO, or EMOs willing to partner with the LEA to start a new school (or convert an existing school) in this location?
- 2. Will qualified community groups initiate a homegrown charter school? The LEA is best served by developing relationships with community groups to prepare them for operating charter schools.
- 3. Based on supply and capacity, which option is most likely to result in acceptable student growth for the student population to be served—homegrown charter school, CMO, or EMO?
- 4. How can statutory, policy, and collective bargaining language relevant to the school be negotiated to allow for closure of the school and restart?
- 5. How will support be provided to staff that are reassigned to other schools as a result of the restart?
- 6. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
- 7. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the charter school with access to contractually specified district services and access to available funding?
- 8. How will the SEA assist with the restart?

- 9. What performance expectations will be contractually specified for the charter school, CMO, or EMO?
- 10. Is the LEA (or other authorizer) prepared to terminate the contract if performance expectations are not met?

The Transformation Model

- 1. How will the LEA select a new leader for the school, and what experience, training, and skills will the new leader be expected to possess?
- 2. How will the LEA enable the new leader to make strategic staff replacements?
- 3. What is the LEA's own capacity to support the transformation, including the implementation of required, recommended, and diagnostically determined strategies?
- 4. What changes in decision making policies and mechanisms (including greater school-level flexibility in budgeting, staffing, and scheduling) must accompany the transformation?
- 5. What changes in operational practice must accompany the transformation, and how will these changes be brought about and sustained?

School Closure Model

- 1. What are the metrics to identify schools to be closed?
- 2. What steps are in place to make certain closure decisions are based on tangible data and readily transparent to the local community?
- 3. How will the students and their families be supported by the LEA through the re-enrollment process?
- 4. Which higher-achieving schools have the capacity to receive students from the schools being considered for closure?
- 5. How will the receiving schools be staffed with quality staff to accommodate the increase in students?
- 6. How will current staff be reassigned—what is the process for determining which staff members are dismissed and which staff members are reassigned?
- 7. Does the statutory, policy, and collective bargaining context relevant to the school allow for removal of current staff?
- 8. What supports will be provided to recipient schools if current staff members are reassigned?
- 9. What safety and security considerations might be anticipated for students of the school to be closed and the receiving school(s)?
- 10. What are the budgetary implications of retaining surplus staff within the LEA if that is necessary?
- 11. How will the LEA track student progress in the recipient schools?
- 12. What is the impact of school closure to the school's neighborhood, enrollment area, or community?
- 13. How does school closure fit within the LEA's overall reform efforts?

APPENDIX E

Grant Evaluation Rubric

COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1. The school presents data from the listed sources (administrators, teachers, students, and parents).

Accep	otable	Not Acceptable				
The needs are based on data collected from a variety of sources (administrators, teachers, students, and parents) with tables included.						
3 points - All of the listed sources are included in identifying the needs, and data are presented.	2 points - Three of the listed sources are included in identifying the needs, and data are presented.	1 point - Two of the listed sources are included in identifying the needs, and data are presented.	0 points - data were collected from a single source, or source information is not presented.			
Rationale/Comments:						

- 2. Data are based on an adequate sampling of individuals and groups.
 - All sampling parameters must receive an Acceptable rating.
 - If a Parent Focus Group is used in place of Parent Questionnaires, as long as this focus group meets the minimal sample size, then the Parent parameter receives a rating of "b".
 - Sample Frame: Focus Groups Parents (Table 8)
 - o Minimum: 1 group of 6 participants
 - o Maximum: 3 groups of 8 participants (i.e., Grades K-5; Grades 6-8; Grades 9-12)

Acce	ptable	Not Acceptable					
The perceptual and observational needs assessment data are used based on an adequate sample of individuals and groups. (See Sampling Parameters for Acceptable values.)							
3 points - All of the sample sizes are acceptable.	2 points - All of the sample sizes are acceptable, except Parent Questionnaires which were replaced with Parent Focus Groups.	1 point Some sample sizes are acceptable.	0 points - No sample size data were evident.				
Rationale/Comments:	•						

3. Multiple data sources are present.

- Cognitive Data (Student Performance): PAWS data (see embedded template for this data),
 MAP data, and data from another rigorous LEA-based assessment are included
 - Preferably, most current detailed data with examination of specific areas of weaknesses and a comparison to previous years' data (example 3 years).
 - o Cognitive data may also include:
 - Classroom and Unit Assessment
 - IEP Data Progress Reports
- Attitudinal Data: For an acceptable rating, questionnaires and faculty needs assessment, including summaries, must be presented
- Behavioral Data:
 - A classroom observations summary must be presented for this item to be acceptable.
 - At least one of the following items should be included: summary of attendance, graduation, dropout and/or information on suspensions and expulsions.
- Archival Data: Report cards (Parent and Principal), accountability reports (detailed and Subgroup component).

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The needs assessment must incorporate these four types of data: cognitive (student performance), attitudinal, behavioral, and archival.			
3 points - Student and school level data are provided from all four of the listed types of data, and data are presented.	2 points - Student and school level data are provided from three of the listed types of data, and data are presented.	1 point - Student and school level data are provided from two of the listed types of data, and data are presented.	0 points - Student and school level data are provided from a single type, or no data are presented.
Rationale/Comments:			

4. Data are accurately interpreted to identify strengths and weaknesses.

- Is the information presented an accurate reflection of the data? Has the school missed pertinent information?
- The STRENGTH should be derived from the strengths in the Accountability Data. Review all summary sheets to determine the strengths.
- The WEAKNESSES should be derived from the weaknesses in the Accountability Data. Analyze the Reports, Summaries, Subgroup Percent Proficient, DRA, DIBELS, PAWS, PAWS Alt MAP, LEA Assessments (DRA, DIBELS, etc...), attendance, graduation and dropout rates to determine the weaknesses.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The needs assessment data are accurately interpreted to identify strengths and weaknesses.			
3 points - All of the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	2 points - Most of the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	1 point - Few of the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	0 points - Strengths or weaknesses are not based on an accurate interpretation of the data.
Rationale/Comments:			

5. Contributing factors relate to the strengths and weaknesses.

- The contributing factors must be listed.
- Look for things that are most directly related to student learning and that the school has the most control over (not parental involvement, but something like the "Taught" Curriculum).
- May have multiple factors for one strength/weakness. For example, if the weakness is in the reading comprehension, possible contributing factors may be:
 - (a) Teacher's lack of effective instructional strategies, such as Higher Order Thinking Skills.
 - (b) Lack of effective alignment of taught curriculum to standards and Grade Level Expectations.
 - (c) Lack of effective instructional leadership.
 - (d) Lack of effective time management, a schoolwide positive behavior support system, and/or an attendance policy.
 - (e) Failure to implement effective accommodations and modifications.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.			
3 points - All contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	2 points - Most contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	1 point - Few contributing factors related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.	O points - Contributing factors are not related to the strengths and weaknesses are based on an accurate interpretation of the data.
Rationale/Comments:			

INTERVENTION MODELS

- 1. Selected Intervention Model (if correctly implemented) directly and positively influence the contributing factors to the weaknesses found.
 - If the contributing factors are not identified, this item is to be rated not acceptable.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable		
Interventions directly address contributing factors of strengths and weaknesses.			
2 points - Intervention directly addresses contributing factors of strengths and weaknesses.	0 points - Intervention does not address contributing factors of strengths and weaknesses.		
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Interventions are implemented with available or obtainable fiscal and human resources.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable	
Interventions can be implemented with available or obtainable fiscal and human resources.		
2 points - Intervention can be implemented with available or obtainable resources.	0 points - The intervention can't be implemented with available or obtainable resources.	
Rationale/Comments:		

INTERVENTION MODELS - REQUIRED ELEMENTS (Tier I and II Schools Only)

NOT APPLICABLE, Tier III school

1. All Required elements as present.

Acceptable	Not Acceptable		
All required elements as outlined in the final requirements are present for the Intervention Model selected.			
2 points – all required elements are present. 0 points – one or more required elements are mis			
Rationale/Comments:			

APPLICABLE for the in	tervention selected (Clo	sure, Transformation, o	r Turnaround Model
 The LEA has pr process of all p The LEA will ha 	ovided detail as to how ovided enough detail to providers as taken into considera el's theory of action ar	to show how they will	conduct a rigorous
Acce	otable	Not Ac	ceptable
2 points – LEA has a rigor	ous review process in place.	review process in place.	
Rationale/Comments:		<u> </u>	
LAN – ACTIVITES	are written in a logica	al, sequential order.	
			ceptable
Acce	otable	Not Ac	
Acce	otable cal sequence of events to rea		
Acce			0 points - None of the events are in logical orde

Administrators, teachers, and others share in responsibility.
Position titles of the responsible person(s) must be listed.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The action plan clearly identifies who will be responsible for implementing the activity.			
3 points - All activities clearly indicate which staff and/or administrators will be responsible for implementing the activity.	2 points - Most activities clearly state which staff and/or administrators will be responsible.	1 point - Few activities clearly state who will be responsible, or only one person is responsible for all activities.	0 points - There is no link between the goals and student learning and the directions for school improvement.
Rationale/Comments:			

3. Activities are clearly described.

Describe what and how the actual activity will be performed by the staff, not a random list. Integrate such areas as literacy and numeracy, professional development, transition, family and community involvement, behavior, and technology.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The action plan clearly states how each activity will be performed.			
3 points - It is evident how each activity will be performed.	2 points - It is evident how most activities will be performed.	1 point - There is little evidence of how the activities will be performed.	0 points - There is no evidence of how the activities will be performed.
Rationale/Comments:			

4. Timelines and dates for activities are specific.

Broad time lines, such as "August through May", are not sufficient. Use more specific terms, such as monthly, bimonthly, every 2nd Tuesday of the month, weekly, etc.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
A responsible time line is assigned to each activity.			
3 points - All activities include specific dates.	2 points - Most activities include specific dates.	1 point - Few activities include specific dates.	0 points - None of the activities include specific dates.
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- 1. Professional Development activities describe the purpose, type and who will be involved.
 - All personnel (teachers, administrators, counselors, paraprofessionals, and other staff) should be included in appropriate Professional Development opportunities. The use of "instructional staff" or "faculty" in the description is too general to determine which groups of personnel are represented.
 - Personnel must be identified by subgroups (teachers, administrators, counselors, paraprofessionals, support staff, etc).

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Professional Development identifies the purpose of the activities, how the activities will take place, and who will be involved.			
3 points - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for most activities.	2points - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for most activities.	1 point - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for few activities.	0 points - Purpose, procedures, and participants are specified for none of the activities
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Job – embedded Professional Development provides teachers time to consult together about common instructional problems, engage in joint curriculum planning, share knowledge, observe skills, conduct action research, coach one another, and obtain new ideas and approaches from colleagues during the course of the work day.

Job – embedded Professional Development has three major attributes:

- Relevance Time is created for the PD to occur as a part of the normal work routine.
- Feedback Sustained support and attention through mentoring, dialogue, and study groups.
- Transfer of Practice Self reflection, action research, peer coaching or observations, and group problem solving.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Professional Development is job – embedded and occurs at least monthly.			
3 points - Weekly/Bi- weekly job-embedded professional development activities are presented.	2 points - At least monthly job-embedded professional development activities are presented.	1 point - Professional development activities on a monthly basis are presented, but they are not job-embedded.	0 points - Professional development activities are not frequent or jobembedded.
Rationale/Comments:			

- 3. Follow-up and support are scheduled activities.
 - Look for follow-up and support in the activities and formative evaluation columns with an adequate description.
 - Example of follow-up/support: Trainers scheduled to return after initial training to provide additional assistance in implementation; principal, instructional coaches, or Distinguished Educator modeling lessons, practice with feedback, mentoring, videotape analysis, and study groups.

Acceptable		Not Acc	eptable
Follow-up/support is an actual scheduled activity and is consistent.			
3 points - All activities include scheduled follow-up/support.	2 points - At least 75% of the activities include scheduled follow-up/support.	1 point - Less than 75% of the activities include scheduled follow-up/support.	0 points - Activities do not include scheduled follow-up/support.
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN - FAMILY AND CON	MMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
------------------------------	---------------------

Family and Community Involvement is NOT APPLICABLE for the intervention selected (Clo	sure or Restart
Model)	

1. Family and community involvement activities are clearly linked to the objectives through the strategies.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Family involvement activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.			
3 points - All activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.	2 points - At least 75% of activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.	1 point - At least 50% of activities are clearly linked to the identified objectives.	0 points - Activities are not clearly linked to the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

- 2. Activities pertaining to content/training involve family members.
 - Are a sufficient number of content/training activities included to involve family members in student daily or weekly, or only one time a semester?

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Activities that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.			
3 points - Monthly activities that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.	2 points - Quarterly activities that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.	1 point - Activities once a semester that encourage family members to participate in student learning are included.	0 points - No activities encourage family members to participate in student learning.
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN – MODIFYIN	G POLICIES AND PRACTICES
------------------------	--------------------------

Modifying Policies and Practices is NOT APPLICABLE for the intervention selected (Closure or Restart
Model)

- 1. The school is committed to modifying existing practices and policies so interventions can be fully and effectively implemented.
 - Are the activities selected new and innovative, or are the practices and activities that are already occurring all applicable activities?
 - School is clearly moving to reform existing policy and practices.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The school is committed to modifying existing practices and policies so interventions can be fully and effectively implemented			
3 points - activities are new and innovative; school is moving to reform the school	2 points - Most activities are new and innovative; school is moving to reform the school	1 point - Few activities are new and innovative; school is moving to reform the school	0 points - activities are not new and innovative; school is not moving to reform the school
Rationale/Comments:			

ACTION PLAN – FUNDING

- 1. Monetary resources are allocated and aligned to reach identified objectives.
 - Is funding provided for all applicable activities? Details in the action plan should indicate how expenses are to be utilized.
 - Are the monies being allocated to school improvement?
 - Are the monetary resources allocated to the strategies sufficient to make a difference?

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Monetary resources are allocated in a manner that will facilitate achieving the identified objectives.			
3 points - Monetary resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	2 points - Most monetary resources are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	1 point - Few monetary resources are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	0 points - Monetary resources are not targeted to reach the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Sufficient time is allocated to achieve the objectives.

- Determine if time is allocated for professional development (i.e., common planning periods, extended school day for professional development, etc.)
- Identify any changes made to improve time on task (i.e., change of school day schedule, classroom management issues, etc.)

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Time is allocated in a manner that will facilitate achieving the objectives.			
3 points - Time allocations are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	2 points - Most time allocations are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	1 point - Few time allocations are targeted to reach the identified objectives.	0 points - Time allocations are not targeted to reach the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

3. Human resources are allocated to include a variety of people responsible for the activities.

- Share responsibility among teachers, principals, counselors, and parents.
- Utilize internal and external human resources.
- Use teaching staff for coaching and mentoring.
- Collaborate with the state and community personnel and agencies.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Human resources are allocated in a manner that will facilitate the objectives.			
3 points - Human resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	2 points - Most human resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	1 point - Few human resources are clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.	0 points - Human resources are not clearly targeted to reach the identified objectives.
Rationale/Comments:			

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING INDICATORS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- 1. The formative (short term) evaluation procedures to monitor and assess the indicators of implementation for all strategies include at least three of the four of the following criteria:
 - (a) What data instrument will be used to collect information and what kind of feedback will be given?
 - (b) What will be measured or assessed, and how will this information be used?
 - (c) Who will conduct the evaluation?
 - (d) How often (frequency)?
 - In order for sign-in sheets and workshop evaluations to be acceptable, a description of how
 they will be used to access the effectiveness and implementation of the activity must be
 presented.
 - These evaluation procedures provide documentation of degree of implementation.
 - These evaluation procedures will provide information to determine if the activities are actually implemented in the classroom.

Example:

Classroom observations conducted by the principal and the staff developer will assess the degree of implementation of Higher Order Thinking Skills each quarter and will include feedback, follow-up and support.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Procedures are provided to monitor and assess the indicators of implementation for all strategies set forth in the action plan			
3 points - Clear procedures are provided and assess the level of implementation of indicators for all strategies.	2 points - Clear procedures are provided and assess the level of implementation of indicators for most strategies.	1 point - Unclear procedures are provided and assess the level of implementation of few activities, or some procedures are unclear.	0 points - Clear procedures are not provided to evaluate the implementation of indicators for strategies.
Rationale/Comments:			

- 2. The summative (long-term) evaluation procedures seek to determine if the goals and objectives have been attained.
 - Will the summative evaluation adequately convey if the school is improving?
 - The summative evaluation should include the applicable testing instruments with descriptions of how they will be used to determine if the goals and objectives are attained.
 - This evaluation should include a comparison and/or analysis test data but may also include other types of assessment and/or qualitative data.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Valid procedures are provided to examine the degree to which the identified goals and objectives have been attained.			
3 points - Valid procedures are provided to examine the degree to which the goals and objectives have been attained.	2 points - Procedures are presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.	1 point - Vague or incomplete procedures are presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.	O points - Valid procedures are not presented to determine whether the goals and objectives have been attained.
Rationale/Comments:			

IMPLEMENTATION INDICATOR (GOALS):

- 1. Goals are directly linked to student learning.
 - Look at the overall clarity and presentation of the goals.
 - If goals are accomplished, will the school improve academically?

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
I. The goals are linked to student learning and clearly state the direction of school improvement.			
3 points - The goals are clearly link to student learning and state the direction for school improvement.	2 points - The goals are linked to student learning and state the direction for school improvement in a relatively clear manner.	1 point - The link between the goals and student learning and school improvement is unclear or weak.	0 points - There is no link between the goals and student learning and the directions for school improvement.
Rationale/Comments:			

- 2. Goals address the weaknesses with top priority being in Academic Achievement.
 - The goals should be derived from data from the following sources: PAWS, MAP, Attendance and/or Dropout Graduation Rate, DRA, DIBELS, Pre-K/Kindergarten Screening tests, or other standardized teacher – made unit assessments.
 - Should limit goals to one (1) or two (2).
 - Exception: If the goals are stated in measurable terms, they must use accurate measures to receive a rating no higher than a 'b".

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The goals accurately address the schools weaknesses in Academic Achievement.			
3 points – All weaknesses are clearly addressed.	2 points - Most weaknesses are addressed.	1 point - It indirectly refers to learning for all students.	0 points - It does not directly or indirectly refer to learning for all students.
Rationale/Comments:			

DESIRED OUTCOMES (OBJECTIVES)

1. Objectives presented are accurate and verifiable in relation to growth.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
The objectives have measureable (verifiable) outcomes.			
3 points - All of the objectives can be verified/measured.	2 points - Most of the objectives can be verified/measured.	1 point - Few of the objectives can be verified/measured.	0 points - None of the objectives can be verified/measured.
Rationale/Comments:			

2. Each objective is clearly linked to a specified goal.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Each objective is clearly linked to a specified goal and clearly states the direction of school improvement.			
3 points - All of the objectives are clearly linked to specific goals and state the direction for school improvement.	2 points - Most of the objectives are clearly linked to specific goals and state the direction for school improvement in a relatively clear manner.	1 point - Few of the objectives are clearly linked to specific goals and school improvement.	0 points - There is no link between the goals and student learning, and the direction for school improvement.
Rationale/Comments:			

BUDGET

1. Budget is set, matched to expenditures, sufficient for all activities associated with the intervention model selected, and is for the whole life of the grant cycle.

Acceptable		Not Acceptable	
Budget accurate and fiscally responsible.			
3 points - All expenditures are adequately described, allowable, and aligned with the project goals and objectives over the whole grant cycle.	2 points - Most expenditures are adequately described, allowable, and aligned with the project goals and objectives over the whole grant cycle.	0 points - Most expenditures are adequately described, allowable, and aligned with the project goals and objectives.	0 points - There is little or no alignment of the expenditures with the project activities.
Rationale/Comments:			